The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XXI NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1919 NUMBER 265

Contents

The Week 127

Editorials

Mr. Knox's Resolution 129
European Distress and American Honor 130
Bungling the Railroad Problem 132
Platforms for Progressives 133

General Articles

Disordered Christianity ..... Herbert Croly 136
A Christmas Carol ..... C. M. 139
The Body and the Soul (Verse) ..... Yenomdrah Mala 141
News from the Sickroom .. Edward G. Lowry 141
Mountains (Verse) ..... Robert J. Roe 143
The Press and Public Opinion . Frank I. Cobb 144
After the Play ..... F. H. 148

Reviews of Books

Are we really Christians? ..... F. H. 149
Liberalism in America .... Walter Lippmann 150
Recent Publications 151

The Week

SO ENDS a chapter in American history. On December 21, 1919, one hundred and thirty years after the foundation of the American government, the right of asylum was abolished, and the ancient institutions of banishment and exile reestablished. That is what will be remembered of the voyage of the Buford. Of those who applaud or acquiesce today, many will in later years think back to this and feel the humiliation of it. They will recall that this is not the America that the world knew for over a century and believed in so profoundly. They will wonder how the strongest government on earth could have stooped to so undignified an abandonment of a sacred tradition. They will wonder what distemper affected a free people that it could so lose its self-possession as to bundle off at night to an unknown destination a mass of alien refugees without even granting them that process of law, a trial by jury, on which the meanest murderer can count. They will not call the petty panic-stricken bureaucrats who decreed this wholesale banishment the saviors of America, nor will they describe as 100 per cent American those who screamed approval without taking the trouble to find out whether, for example, the seventeen year old boy who was shipped with the cargo, was indeed a menace to this nation of a hundred million people. For those who have had a hand in this unsavory business, he who writes the history of 1919 can only plead for charity: they were little, bewildered, frightened men, led by other men who knew nothing and cared less about the soul of America. They could not do justice, or love mercy, or walk humbly before their God or their fellowmen because out of an unworthy and senseless fear they had raised momentarily an ecstasy of self-righteousness.

HEARINGS before a committee of the Senate, publication of the President's letter to his new commission, and statements by the coal operators develop the amazing fact that formally, at least, no agreement was entered into when the coal strike ended. At that time Mr. Lewis announced that the miners had accepted a fourteen per cent increase, and that both operators and miners had agreed to abide by the decision of a Presidential commission which was to consider the question of further increases. The Attorney-General confirmed these terms. He said (December 10th) that he "understood the operators' committee had announced their acceptance" of an agreement which was to give the Presidential commission power "to readjust both wages and prices" after its investigation. It was this acceptance by both parties and by the government that gave the investigating committee its authority.

BUT THE OPERATORS now declare they have never accepted Mr. Palmer's settlement. They "have not agreed to any memorandum such as that mentioned in the President's letter to Messrs. Robinson, White and Peale," and they "were not

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

consulted as to the terms and conditions of the agreement entered into between the government and the miners." Confronted with this testimony Mr. Palmer is vague. He does not definitely say that the operators ever told him they would accept a settlement which provided for a commission whose recommendations would be compulsory. And in failing to make such a statement he lays himself and the government open to the charge of sending the miners back to work under false pretenses. The miners went back to their jobs when Mr. Palmer told them, on December 10th, that he "understood the operators' committee had announced their acceptance" of the settlement. Mr. Palmer never altered this statement. If he did not know where the operators stood, he was careless to an incredible degree; if he did know, and kept silent, he is guilty of bad faith.

SENATOR FALL takes a despondent view of our relations with Mexico. He believes we shall "wash our hands in invisible water, roll our eyes upward and proclaim 'Peace on earth, good will to bandits'." In part this pessimism seems founded on a fear that we shall not return a sufficiently virile answer to Mexico's latest note in the Jenkins case. The Mexican note questions the impartiality of the evidence with which the American State Department has been supplied, and asserts that in any case "the Mexican government cannot admit that American citizens can be judged and set free on simple information of the Department of State, or recommendations or suggestions of the United States, instead of being tried by its courts conforming to Mexican laws." So reasonable is this statement of the Mexican viewpoint that it is difficult to believe Mr. Lansing's next note will contest it.

IF GOVERNOR COOLIDGE'S victory was a triumph for law and order in Massachusetts, what is the election of Victor Berger in Wisconsin? Certainly it is something more than a victory for the Milwaukee Socialists. For Berger received approximately forty per cent more votes than he did a year ago—and the New York Sun's correspondent estimates that more than half of the total number came from non-Socialist electors. What is the answer? So far as the non-Socialist voters are concerned, very likely it is something like this: Victor Berger was elected in 1918 by a constituency that had every chance to approve or disapprove his war record. The House of Representatives overruled the decision of these voters. Its method of taking that action showed it to be stampeded by the prevailing hysteria. We are not Socialists. But we will vote for a Socialist candidate because we do not propose to let hysteria rule. An essential duty of those who believe in law and order, we think, is a stand against intolerance.

WHY WAS Mr. Palmer's victory over the packers "received with what appears to be enthusiasm" in the packers' offices? That was what the New York Times reported, and it may have puzzled some readers of the news. But probably not very many. The majority may have thought of the dissolution of the American Tobacco Company and the Standard Oil, and smiled. "There was particular satisfaction in the establishment of Swift & Company," said the Times, "because that concern has been in process of dissolution for two years." Many of the activities in which the settlement forbids the packers to indulge, such as the retail meat business and the "public" warehouses, are no real loss to them. The essential weakness in the Attorney-General's plan, however, is that it provides no adequate governmental control over the stockyards, terminals and other utilities of which the packers are to dispose.

STATESMEN, in their tilts with legislative bodies, are customarily granted a special license so far as accuracy goes. But what prompted Mr. Lloyd George to say to the House of Commons that the Anglo-Franco-American alliance would be approved by the Senate "for the simple reason that I cannot imagine that the United States would dishonor the signature of its great representative"? Mr. George surely knows that the one thing Mr. Wilson fought against until he felt himself forced to compromise was an alliance outside the League; that America, while supporting the idea of a general world federation as represented at the Hague, has consistently steered clear of special alliances; and, finally, that the signature of no President is effective upon a treaty without the ratification of the Senate. Under the circumstances Mr. George might have gone a little easier on us.

IN HIS REMARKS to the House Mr. George confirmed the report that the London Conference had decided to abandon intervention in Russia. He went beyond this announcement and declared: "If the Bolsheviki want to speak for Russia, they can do so by summoning a National Assembly, freely elected." This is the first positive effort that has been made for many months toward a clarification of Allied policy. Mr. George is getting back onto sound ground again. It is clear that only a victory in fairly conducted elections could entitle the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Soviet government to Allied recognition. But it is one thing to withhold recognition from a government that has not summoned a national assembly—and another to maintain a blockade, intrigue with representatives of an obsolete Tsarism, and ship armies into Russia to kill that country's people.

MR. D'OLIER'S warning to the American Legion against a policy of molesting civil liberties is a welcome and long-awaited statement. There are various signs within the organization of reaction against mob rule. The Executive Committee of Empire Post No. 250 has petitioned the national organization to notify all branches "that it is not the function of American Legion posts; and it is counter to American ideals, to interfere with orderly meetings and discussion of changes in our political system." A similar warning is issued by Edward F. Bassett, commander of Silver Bow Post No. 1. In the Butte Daily Bulletin Mr. Bassett is quoted as actually saying that "the I. W. W. in Centralia, who fired upon the men that were attempting to raid the I. W. W. headquarters, were fully justified in their act . . . Whether the I. W. W. is a meritorious organization or not, whether it is unpopular or otherwise, should have absolutely nothing to do with the case. The reports of the evidence at the coroner's jury show that the attack was made before the firing started . . . Anyone who becomes a party to a mob bent upon unlawful violence cannot expect the truly patriotic men of the American Legion to condone his act."

AS A MODEL of terseness and definiteness we print the platform adopted by the convention of the Committee of Forty-eight in St. Louis: Public ownership of transportation, including stock yards, large abattoirs, grain elevators, terminal warehouses, pipe lines and tanks. Public ownership of other public utilities and of the principal natural resources, such as coal, oil, natural gas, mineral deposits, large water powers and large commercial timber tracts. No land (including natural resources) and no patents be held out of use for speculation or to aid monopoly. We favor taxes to force idle land into use. Equal economic, political and legal rights for all irrespective of sex or color. The immediate and absolute restoration of free speech, free press, peaceable assembly and all civil rights guaranteed by the Constitution. We demand the abolition of injunctions in labor cases. We indorse the effort of labor to share in the management of industry and labor's right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of its own choosing.

MOST OF THE foreign dispatches attribute Paderewski's resignation in Poland to his administrative difficulties. That is probably the case. For a year the government's chief activity has been raising and trying to maintain armies. Re-distribution of the land and other domestic questions have had to wait, and discontent has spread among the peasant and working classes. The French Foreign Office gave Paderewski a program with which he was certain to fail sooner or later.

WE SHOULD like to call the attention of our readers, especially those who do not feel that the blockade of Soviet Russia has been justified by its results, to the appeal of the American Women's Emergency Committe printed in this issue of the New Republic. To send milk and medicine for innocent sufferers is a singularly appropriate way in which to affirm our faith in the ideal of peace on earth and good will.

Mr. Knox's Resolution

SENATOR KNOX'S latest resolution, coming as it does right after the meeting of the Republican National Committee, is an interesting estimate of what the Republicans think the bulk of the voters are thinking. According to this estimate they are not thinking at all about any of the terms of peace, except those which mean hard cash to American citizens. But at the same time they are thinking in a vague, a half-hearted way about reduction of armaments and "peace." Senator Knox may be correct. At this moment his resolution may be a fairly accurate picture of popular desires. It is not a picture that Americans will long contemplate with pleasure, nor one that they can proudly transmit to their descendants. They will not care to think of themselves as having withdrawn from world responsibilities, not because the particular settlements were repugnant to their principles and dangerous to the security of the world, but simply because they were lazy, and then with a billion dollars or so of property in their pockets. If this is the mood of America, the mood of disenchantment, it would be well for the Senators to recall the fine words of Mr. Oliver in his life of Alexander Hamilton:

> "The spirit of the nation is a great force, but it is one which cannot be always on the alert, and, while it sleeps, the part of noble institutions is to keep watch."

In establishing the conviction that the settlement reached at Paris cannot be underwritten by America, the Senators no matter what their orginal

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

motives, in spite even of much bad manners and irrelevant truculence, have done what in the long run, and not such a very long run at that, will prove a service to the whole world. But it will be a negative service, and it might easily be a constructive one.

What are the elements of the problem? First, that the attempt to enforce the policy devised at Paris in 1919 would cause such a deep and permanent feud in civilization as to make inevitable decades of disorder. The treaties framed at Paris are built upon deception of the Allied peoples, and impose conditions upon all the populations east of the Rhine which make recuperation infinitely difficult. There is no peace in them for a stricken world, and therefore there is no advantage in making the desperate attempt to enforce them with American aid. That is the first and the basic element of the problem. The second follows from it: the settlements of Versailles are nothing but an extended armistice, and the real peace conference has yet to convene. The third follows from the other two: it is that the purpose of the Lodge reservations, while more or less applicable to the present treaty, are in the long run an utterly impossible formula of American world policy. They are impossible in the long run because they envisage a world of armed commercial competition, and provide for no adequate international cooperation.

Suppose that a Senator, accepting the truth of these propositions, were to spend his Christmas holidays formulating a "compromise" program. What could he propose which would most nearly meet the needs of the situation and still be true to the finest aspirations for which the war was fought? He would, it seems to us, ratify the treaty with a reservation embodying some such thought as this:

That the United States reserves to itself full liberty of action under the terms of this treaty, participating only as a consulting member of the League and as an active member only when its judgment supports a particular decision. That this participation is for a definite term of years, say five, at the end of which period a new world conference shall convene to consider all questions affecting the peace of the world.

A reservation of this kind would take care of Article X and all the rest, and at the same time it would provide the believers in the treaty with an opportunity to demonstrate, if they can, that the peace of Versailles has in it the germs of order and reconstruction. The only differences between this proposal and unconditional ratification are that the settlement is frankly acknowledged to be temporary. On the other hand it does avoid all the inconveniences of outright rejection, as well as the humiliating features of the Knox resolution.

The effect on Europe would be excellent. It would show that the United States in neither gullible nor unfriendly, that it knew how to avoid the Scylla of Wilson and the Charybdis of Lodge. It would show something far more important, namely, that the American Senate was acting not on a narrow view of American interest but on a conception of world politics as they exist at this juncture. That is of great significance. For America cannot serve Europe, as President Wilson tried to, by yielding to the politicians or to the crowd psychology of Europe. We are of no use as a pawn. We are of no use as a nation too ignorant to make our detachment serve the cause of peace. The thing that has been dishonored in Europe is not Mr. Wilson's signature, but America's reputation as a free people capable of an independent and constructive policy. The Senate can in some measure restore the prestige of free government, if in ratifying the treaties, it passes judgment upon their terms, acknowledges their meaning, and extends to all mankind the hope of an early revision. That hope must exist among men. The soul of the world is sick with disappointment. The fiasco at Paris robbed men of hope. Some new hope there must be, something for which they can work and strive and think, and no better hope exists than that at the end of a few years the wrongs and futilities of this settlement shall be revised by other men.

European Distress and American Honor

WHEN America was balancing the case for and against entering the European war, it was impossible to say whether or not her material interests would be advanced by her belligerency, but the probabilities ran heavily that the costs would greatly outweigh any material gain. For the twenty-five billion, more or less, that was spent, what assets have we to show? Our honor saved, and the Germans thrown back from their design of ruling Europe. Those are ideal assets, but what American will say that they were not worth the material cost? Today Europe is confronted by a peril not incomparable to the German peril. It is the peril of hunger and worklessness, which menaces the lives of ten million or twenty million persons, according to the best authority in the world, Mr. Hoover. That is many more lives than were fed into the furnace of the World War. The German menace involved more than millions of lives; it involved the establishment of new conditions un-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

der which what we have most treasured in civilization might have perished. What of the menace of famine? How much of civilization can survive the decimation of a whole population by hunger, the cramping, physical and mental, of all of a rising generation by malnutrition?

Will it be to our material interest to come to the relief of Europe? That is a question that can not be answered with certainty, but the probabilities greatly favor the contention that it will. All the leading authorities on finance agree that we can not escape our share in the ultimate consequences of Europe's distress. But the calculation of profit and loss is not the essential process in the argument. What is essential is the matter of our national honor. We have overabundance for ourselves and a surplus. Other peoples that were our allies, or that were enemies indeed but now have paid the penalty and are returned to the community of nations of which we are a part, are starving and disintegrating. Is such a condition in keeping with a nice sense of honor on our part? When we helped to set up an independent Poland, Czechoslovakia, Jugoslavia, we did not promise them that we should look on indifferently while they struggled in vain to reach a firm economic footing. When we demanded of Germany and Austria-Hungary unconditional surrender, we did not proclaim that one of the consequences would be as bitter privations as they had endured in time of war. If we prove that we care nothing about the present fate of Europe, it will be impossible to convince either the present or future generations of Europe that our high professions in the late war were anything but humbug. Our record in the war will be smudged, indelibly, if we hold ourselves aloof from all responsibility for the work of restoration.

Our professions were not just humbug, and we do in fact desire to help, but how can it be done, practically? Not by private charity, for however well we might organize ourselves for charitable relief, we would reach only an infinitesimal part of the misery and disorder by such means. Not even by public charity, for no kind of gratuity is more than a palliative. We must, in the main, work through the normal processes of exchange of values for values,giving goods at fair prices in return for such values as the peoples needing the goods can offer. They can not offer gold nor goods in adequate volume. They can only offer their credit. That is the basis on which we are now trading with them. Their just grievance against us is that we do not take their credit at a fair value, but at a discount that makes trade with us ruinous. Take our wheat at our price, we say in effect, and we will take your sterling or francs or crowns at our price too. And that price we will fix, not according to real considerations of your solvency, but according to considerations of our strategic trading advantages, just as an unscrupulous private dealer, knowing that his customer is solvent and can pay in a year or two may charge one hundred per cent in excess, counting upon the customer's need.

When the French buy wheat of us we ask only our fair price in dollars, but count the dollars as ten francs or more. Now, there is no question that the French currency is actually depreciated. You can prove that by an analysis of its purchasing power in France. But it is far from having fallen to half its value. Consequently a considerable proportion of the premium on dollars we demand of the French is simply an unjust profit we sweat out of our former Allies. We dock the pound sterling by about a dollar, which is fifty cents too much. We dock the Dutch florin eight per cent, the Swedish crown twenty per cent, the Norwegian twenty-five per cent, the Danish thirty, although all those northern neutrals are sounder financially than they were before the war when we took their money as often at a premium as at a discount. We take the German mark at one-tenth of its nominal value and the Austrian crown for one-thirtieth. Jugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Poland we treat rather worse than Germany and rather better than Austria. In all these cases there is in fact a tremendous real depreciation, for which we are not at all responsible. But in every case the domestic purchasing power of those currencies argues a far higher value than the one we fix in our exchange relations. We mulct them all beyond their sins. Is it a wonder that we are coming to be regarded throughout Europe in the light of detestable extortioners, and that even the French office of reconstruction advises that purchases be made in Germany, when possible, rather than in America? The Germans have ceased destroying by artillery fire; we continue to destroy by an exaggerated rate of exchange.

That is a condition we can not afford to tolerate longer. We do not need to tolerate it. There is no fundamental reason why we should not take enough British paper, French, Belgian, Dutch, Scandinavian, to restore exchange with those countries to a normal basis. There is a reason why this does not take place automatically. Our banks and our investing public are not accustomed to dealing in long term credits with foreign commerce. They can not suddenly acquire the habit. But the Government could correct this difficulty immediately and without loss by raising a loan on its own credit and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

selling abroad exchange on America at par, so far as actual depreciation does not demand a definite discount. That would restore at once normal commercial relations with western Europe and enable our late Allies and the neutrals to purchase here food and materials and machinery at reasonable prices, as measured in their own currencies. That would not suffice for the graver problems of central Europe, but it would help. The revival of commercial movements in the western countries would inevitably stimulate commerce and industry in central Europe too.

For central Europe the only adequate remedy is a long term loan, made directly to governments, with restrictions insuring that the sums loaned would be used for provisioning the people and restoring industry, not for military preparations. Such loans would involve some risk of loss. Are the people of America terrified by the thought of some risk? Let the Government try us. It is possible to do so by offering a loan on the terms of the last Liberty loan, which involved a definite sacrifice on the part of subscribers. For the sake of our national honor, let us have a chance to make a sacrifice for the rescue of the peoples of central Europe from famine and despair.

But must not the peace be ratified before we can do anything? That is an argument more cogent with those who wish a particular kind of ratification at all costs than with those who are really concerned over Europe. The correction of exchange with western Europe need not wait a moment upon ratification. Neither the need nor the solvency of those countries turns upon the character of our Treaty ratification. Final peace will hasten recovery in central Europe, but its effects will be of a character imperceptible for months. Real and immediate aid to Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Jugoslavia can come only through generous public loans. To raise the funds for such loans will take time, more than will probably be consumed in ratifying the Treaty. Why are we delaying about it? Those nations and their needs exist; their boundaries are not to be determined by our Senate, nor the indemnities they are to pay or receive. Do we fear that reparation commissions on which we may or may not be represented will permit the confiscation for other use of the proceeds of loans we make specifically for purposes of rehabilitation? That is to impute the deepest dishonor to our Allies. No: if we refuse to help Europe, if we delay about it, let us admit frankly that it is because we care only for ourselves. Let us admit that humanity and honor count for little in the motives that rule our international policy.

Bungling the Railroad Problem

IT has now become apparent that Congress has failed utterly and abjectly in its attempt to initiate and carry through a railroad policy. Despite a year of undisturbed opportunity for investigation and thought, the best advice which expert knowledge and experience could offer, and a complete free hand as far as the administration was concerned, nothing has been produced by either House which offers the slightest promise of success. And now that Congress has adjourned for the holidays without legislation, with the President's promise to return the roads to private ownership on January 1st as yet unmodified, it is apparent that not only has a negative failure been achieved but a positively dangerous and disturbing situation has been created. Only a postponement of the date of return by the President can avert a financial catastrophe.

Although as yet no intimation has come from the White House, it now seems probable that the railroads will not be returned on January 1st, and that Congress will be given another interval in which to legislate. To assess the probability of any greater success during this interval, it is necessary to understand why Congress has during the past year failed so completely.

In the first place there has been in both House and Senate a persistent and incorrigible tendency to underestimate the difficulty and seriousness of the situation. The leaders in both houses have been content with minor tinkering and patching. They have believed that if only the administrative machinery of rate regulation could be perfected, and a few modifications made in the statutory rule of rate making, the traditional American railway policy could be saved. They have not recognized that the disease from which the railroads are suffering is radical, that it goes to the very foundation of our traditional policy, and that only a radical remedy can cure it. The policy of impotent private operation, coupled with irresponsible and cumbersome public regulation, especially in a period of rising costs, of necessity means financial instability. To make public supervision yet more cumbersome, and private management yet more impotent, is no way of curing the disease. In so far as the traditional system ever had any chance of succeeding, the chance was wrecked by the competitive rivalries inevitable in a system of separately owned railroad corporations. It is no remedy for this defect to turn these private corporations loose, after two years on the leash, with a mandate to spend the next seven years attempting to swallow each other under a system of permissive regional

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

consolidation, and then in their consolidated state to compete more violently than ever. The most pressing and fundamental problem of all arose out of the insistent demand of labor for a larger voice in the management of the roads. It is no solution of this problem to turn the employees over to the tender mercies of the corporate employers, and bind them to their jobs by prohibiting strikes. Only fundamental and radical remedies can cure these defects, and Congressional leaders have been afraid of anything either fundamental or radical.

The second reason for the Congressional fiasco goes to the bottom of our whole system of Congressional government. A problem of such vast complexity, involving so many powerful interested groups, cannot be settled by a process of compromise. There must be a single, organic policy, a clear conception of the end to be sought, and a consistent and unswerving subordination of details to that end. Congress had before it innumerable plans, representing for the most part the divergent points of view of special interests. All it could do was to take from each plan the items which were least likely to create antagonism, and combine them into an incongruous compromise. Perhaps that was inevitable in a legislative body in which there has been no leadership, and no contiuous relation between the nominal leaders and the experts in the administrative branch of the government. Until we reconcile ourselves to the fact that on a major question of complexity and importance the initiative in legislation must come from the executive, and until we effect some organic relation between the executive and the majority in Congress, we cannot expect to make much progress toward a solution of the railroad problem.

The railroad experts in the administration, Mr. McAdoo, and since his resignation, Mr. Hines, with the responsibility and knowledge of expert administrators, have recognized from the outset that mere tinkering and compromise could not solve the railroad problem. Eleven months ago they were warning Congress that the problem was fundamental, and that the attempt of Congressional leaders to solve it offhand would be a failure. Seldom has a warning been more signally vindicated.

If this analysis is correct, the future is not too bright. The immediate financial menace may be averted by a prolongation of federal control. But as long as present conditions in Congress continue, and as long as the Administration refuses to assume the responsibility of initiating and driving through a radical and organic railway policy, not much can be hoped for. Either House and Senate will remain in deadlock, and we will drift along under a regime of repeated prolongations of Federal control or Federal guarantee, or there will be a further compromise between House and Senate, and some combination of the House patchwork and the Senate patchwork will be evolved, a compromise which will be financially workable, if at all, only by virtue of some government guarantee.

To the railroad employees, and to those who agree with them that no permanent solution is possible which does not embody the three major elements of the Plumb plan, governmental responsibility for capital financing, unified non-competitive operation, and a large measure of employees' control of management, the situation brings with it a great opportunity. Let the Brotherhoods so amend their plan that public interests are completely and adequately safeguarded. Let them press for its adoption persistently and wholeheartedly, even to the extent of organizing or joining a new political labor party if the old parties prove hopeless. Time will work in their favor, for the present legislative impasse is merely a reflection of the underlying fact that today only a radical solution of the railroad problem is possible, and that such a solution neither Republican or Democratic leadership is capable of achieving.

Platforms for Progressives

WITHIN the past few weeks there have assembled two conventions of American political and economic progressives. The first consisted of a large number of representatives of organized labor and of the several allied movements, which assembled in Chicago for the purpose of forming a "labor party." The second consisted of a smaller group of middle class "liberals," many of them formerly associated with the Progressive party which assembled in St. Louis for the purpose also of planning future political organization and agitation. These two groups both called conventions or conferences because their convictions made it impossible for them to affiliate either with the Republican, Democratic or Socialist parties. They believed in the introduction of changes into American economic and political institutions so radical that neither the Republican nor Democratic party would consider their program, but they did not believe either in the class struggle or in any of the other revolutionary Socialist formulas. They felt the need of a new political party, composed of thorough-going progressives, and dedicated to persuading the American nation to associate the fulfillment of its national life with the cure of economic abuses and the creation of a more humanized industrial organization.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These conventions of progressives were essentially experimental. The two groups, one consisting chiefly of wage-earners and the other of professional and business men, did not assemble so much for the purpose of actually devising a machinery of partisan action as for that of finding out whether they could agree upon a program, a creed which would unite the several discontented economic groups and which would convert this economic discontent into a working policy, a popular agitation and a living faith, essential to the political affirmation of progressive ideas. An old party which arouses traditional loyalties and is held together by the prospective advantages to its membership of success does not depend for its effective unity chiefly on its platform. But a new party must start on its career as the spear head of a group of living ideas which are capable of arousing enthusiasm and of accomplishing desirable changes in the institutions of a nation. The progressive ideas must contain sufficient variety and flexibility to be successfully applied to many varied and complicated questions of policy, while at the same time they must be united by a fundamental integrity of purpose. The Federalists, the Democrats, the Whigs and the Republicans all represented in the beginning such a group of ideas; and in all these cases the ideas were the reflection of the economic needs of a class in the community whose interests were neglected by the existing party organizations and economic policy of the nation. A progressive party which is to survive must satisfy these requirements.

The program of the group of wage-earners which assembled at Chicago tried to meet these requirements in one way and the program of the St. Louis assemblage tried to meet them in another way. The platform of the proposed Labor party is not either a carefully considered, a coherent or a stirring document. It contains some thirty-one planks, which deal with many existing economic and political abuses and some, perhaps, which do not exist. It is an exhaustive schedule of miscellaneous economic and political reforms, compiled for the purpose of assembling on one comprehensive platform as many discontented groups as possible. But the length of the platform makes it unwieldy and its occupants are of unequal merit. Some of the proposed political reforms are, to say the least, doubtful. In advocating the election of federal judges for short terms, the proposed Labor party has adopted one of the oldest illusions of all American popular parties, the illusion, viz. that the election of judges for short terms increases the disposition of the judiciary to take account of human interests in decisions which involve political and economic issues. The elected judiciary of the states have been less upright and at least as indifferent to human as contrasted with property rights as the appointed federal judiciary. Again in advocating the abolition of the Senate, the labor platform proposed a change in the Constitution which would destroy it as a working instrument and which it is futile to consider except as part of some general plan of constitutional revision. Some of the economic clauses call for analogous criticisms. If adopted into the permanent program of the party they would become a source of weakness rather than of strength. Notwithstanding these drawbacks, however, the platform of the Labor party contains the raw material or rather the half-prepared material out of which the party can eventually forge the needed instrument of progressive agitation and legislation. It is a clear, even if unwieldy and blundering, expression of the needs of a class, whom the existing economic and political organization neglects, the class of the wage-earning worker. It insists on a method of satisfying those needs which, if carried out, would profoundly modify the relation among all the classes in American life, but which seeks finally to bring about a class concert rather than a class struggle.

The virtues and defects of the platform of the Committee of Forty-eight are wholly different from those of the platform of the proposed Labor party. It possesses one enormous merit which is wholly unprecedented in the history of American progressive platforms. It is extremely short and wholly definite and uncompromising. It provides merely for public ownership of transportation, of all public utilities and of the principal natural resources. It declares against the holding of land and patents out of use for speculative purposes. It demands equal rights irrespective of sex and color, the immediate and unqualified restoration of all civil liberties guaranteed by the Constitution, and the effective abolition of injunctions in labor cases. It "endorses" the effort of labor to share in the management of industry and its right to organize and bargain collectively of its own choosing. There are, we believe, defects in this particular formulation of American progressivism; but its merit far outweigh its defects. It is an honest attempt to penetrate to the roots of American economic abuses. It traces those abuses to one of their chief sources, to the appropriation by private business of public utilities and limited natural resources which give to their proprietors an essentially privileged position in the competition of the market. It properly demands the withdrawal of these privileges as the essential condition of a democrati

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

distribution of political and economic power. This succinct statement of one fundamental cause of American economic abuses will eventually awaken a lively and wide-spread response among the small business and professional men of America. It will appeal to essentially the same traditions and interests which were expressed by the progressive movement of 1910-12 and which have dominated the peculiarly American radicalism from Jefferson to the present day. That tradition consists in a demand for the more equal distribution of the opportunities for making money. It looks towards the creation of a commonwealth of small property-owners, none of whom will have any advantage over the others in adding to his wealth except that derived from his ability.

This formulation of progressivism contains, however, a defect which, if it is not remedied, will prevent the party which possessed the power to carry it out from being successful in its enterprise. It relies too much on the remedial magic of the mere fact of government ownership of public utilities and natural resources. Public ownership is one thing. Administration of the trust and the power in the public interest is another thing. The Prussian government owned the railroads of that country, but public ownership did not prevent the rate structure from favoring the cartels. The emphasis in the program of public ownership has the disadvantage of proposing to confer on the government a huge increase in power and responsibility at the very moment when liberals all over the world have reason to revive their former distrust of bureaucrats and public officials. The Committee of Forty-eight submits this program without safeguarding themselves against the obvious objections to it and without endorsing the proposals to protect the public and the workers against bureaucratic dictation and an excess of state power by such a plan as that which is associated in this country with the name of Mr. Plumb.

The problem of introducing social democracy into America, although it requires for its handling a program of public ownership, is less a matter of economic mechanism than the St. Louis platform implies and more a matter of popular re-education. Capitalism, as it has developed in this country, has deprived labor and work of intrinsic dignity and interest. It has created on the one hand a class of manual labor which has no sufficient inducement in showing loyalty to its job or interest in its work and on the other hand a class of administrative chiefs who are much more preoccupied with the art of salesmanship and profit-making than in efficient production. The fundamental problem of social democracy is to restore dignity and interest to labor. It is idle brains and idle hands both among the rich and the poor and among those who are neither rich nor poor which need to be put to work as well as idle land and idle patents. Neither government ownership nor the substitution of small business for big business will of themselves give the needed dignity and interest to labor. That can only come, as it now seems, from some such modification of the wage-system as is exemplified by the Plumb plan. The St. Louis platform looks in that direction when it endorses the "effort of labor to share in the management of industry," but in the discussion of the platform which the Committee has issued with it they ignore the need of reorganizing production and administration or re-educating labor, and dwell exclusively on changes in the mechanism of capitalistic control. The labor plank was, from the point of view of the writers of the platform, merely a concession to another discontented group rather than an integral part of their plan of industrial reconstruction. In this respect the platform will require modification. We fully agree as to the need of contending against the existence of privilege in the mechanism of wealth distribution, but the elimination of economic privilege among property-owners will not be sufficient to create a socialized democracy. That depends upon the recognition of the worker quite as much as on the property-owner as the foundation of the democratic state. The object of its policy should not be to transform the worker into a property-owner but to attach to efficient work such dignity, security and prosperity that property-owners themselves will test their value to the community by what they do rather than what they own.

The New
REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1919, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST ST., NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRES.; ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREAS.

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY — CHARLES MERZ
FRANCIS HACKETT — WALTER LIPPMANN
ALVIN JOHNSON — PHILIP LITTELL
SIGNE TOKSVIG, Assistant Editor

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTIONS FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FIVE DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES FIFTEEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTIONS, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, SIX DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE; REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER.

ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Disordered Christianity

A CANDID and well-informed Christian, no matter how anxious he may be at Christmas, 1919, to make the best of a rebellious world, can hardly regard with anything but dismay the recent behavior and the spiritual outlook of the Christian nations. A year ago they had just emerged from one of the most exhausting, extensive and hideously costly wars in history. Their peoples were still distracted by its strains, enervated by its privations and bleeding from its wounds. Their sufferings were so great that not even the victors could whole-heartedly rejoice. Yet they had more cause for rejoicing a year ago than they have today. They could return at that time devout thanks for deliverance from a truly awful peril, and they could look forward with some confidence to a happier season first of relaxation and then of recuperation and renascence. Those among them who felt deeply the anachronism, the tragedy and the sin of such a ruinous and fratricidal war among Christian peoples could anticipate, not without reason, that the victory of the democratic nations would make for appeasement. The very terms of the armistice provided for the application of healing Christian principles to the wounds of civilization. They promised to the peoples of the world safeguards against a repetition of the tragedy and an express effort to compensate them for their sufferings by the infusion into the political and economic body of a greater consideration for the common human needs and interests.

The events of the past year have not realized these pious anticipations. Wounded soldiers apart, there is as much suffering, privation and frustration in the world today as there was a year ago. Nineteen hundred and nineteen was a year not of recuperation and appeasement but of the dissipation of scanty material resources, of political disintegration, of emotional disenchantment and of egregious moral failure. At the end of it a large part of Europe still suffers from famine, from cold, from idleness and from despair; and it does so less from necessity than as a consequence of the policy deliberately adopted and stubbornly maintained by the Supreme Council of the victors. The triumphant nations have not fairly faced the facts of their own social condition and the problem of their recuperation. They decided to protect themselves first against the recuperation of their former enemies. Their success in keeping Austria, Hungary, Russia and Germany in a state of famine, apprehension, desperation and subjection is and will continue to be the major cause of their own retarded recovery. In spite of their pledges they wrote a Treaty of Peace determined in its chief provisions by fear and revenge rather than by an intelligent desire for permanent appeasement—a Treaty which they are already finding it impossible to execute and which, so far as executed, will keep Europe divided into hostile classes and irreconcilable or conspiring nations. In so far as the situation is changing for the better, as it is, for instance, with respect to Russia, its betterment is the result not of the success of the victors' policy but of its failure. It took thirty years to prove the moral bankruptcy of the statesmanship of the Treaty of Vienna. It will not take fifteen months to prove the moral bankruptcy of the statesmanship of the Treaty of Versailles.

It is as unprofitable to scold Wilson, Lloyd George and Clemenceau for this result as it is to charge up the outbreak of the world war exclusively to the Kaiser. Each of the Allied leaders must, it is true, bear a minor share of responsibility. For if, as alleged, they might have done somewhat worse, they might also have done a good deal better. But the deeper responsibility is not personal. The rescue of the world from the desolation of the war and the redemption of the promise of appeasement placed a strain upon the moral and religious resources of the Christian nations which they were not capable of bearing. The victors were incompetent to extricate themselves with credit from the morass of their victory for the same reason that they were incompetent to avoid their earlier descent into the abyss of the war. They were the spokesmen of an economic, political and social establishment which, although it put forth grandiose pretensions to civilization, always turned, when strained or imperilled by domestic or foreign dangers, instinctively and helplessly to force as the final arbiter. That is the sober, sinister and decisive truth. Until they recognize it, the democratic peoples will never attain to any considerable degree of liberation. If it is true, it constitutes a sufficient explanation of the calamity of the war and the tragedy of the peace. For generations the European nations had deliberately cherished political designs which were incompatible with the security of their neighbors, and they deliberately agreed to leave the final settlement of these conflicts to trial by battle. The clear implication of this reliance on force for the vindication of national policy is the abuse of force in the event of victory.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Because of their constitutionalism or democracy the more civilized nations pretend that in the management of their political and social business they do not leave the final decision to force. They are deceiving themselves. While constitutionalism and democracy have ameliorated some of the evils of the arbitrament of force in politics, they have left it in ultimate command. The state, as now organized, is essentially the embodiment of power rather than justice. Its worshippers, when they proclaim and glorify its sovereign irresponsibility, admit this indictment. It must demand above everything else obedience to its own commands, no matter whether those commands are or are not justifiable. It must insist fanatically on law and order—meaning by law and order, not the triumph of moral knowledge, but the ability of the police to enforce obedience. And the commands which the state must insist all citizens shall obey are commands which are intended in nine cases out of ten to secure to the property-owner not only the undisturbed but usually the exclusive and irresponsible enjoyment of his property. It is of the very essence of the prevailing conceptions both of the state and of property that neither politicians nor property-owners are obliged to recognize any except the mildest obligations in the exercise of their power.

The possessors of this power and their interest in its perpetuation dominate the standards of reputable individual and collective conduct. There was a time when the Christian Church, as the spokesman of the moral and religious interests of mankind, claimed to embody standards of behavior which the state and the property-owner ought to observe in actual practice. It did not, to be sure, have much success in enforcing the claim. But though they never succeeded in bringing about the actual embodiment of Christian standards in political and business behavior, the clergy at least asserted and cherished their own independence of politicians and property-owners and exercised the right to dispose of their own souls. How many of them exercise such a right today? Both politicians and property-owners consider themselves entitled to ignore Christian guidance in exercising political and economic power, to expect or to compel the clergy to agree with them and if necessary to treat disagreement as negligible. The Christian Church as a whole or in part does not protest against the practically complete secularization of political, economic and social life.

There is, unfortunately, an all-too sufficient reason why Christian clergy do not resist the ultimate reign of force in human affairs and the ever completer secularization of society. They themselves are impotent to provide any positive and operative alternative to the reign of force. They do not know how to frame a social order founded on moral knowledge which will work as successfully as the physical order ordained by the state. They do not know how to reorganize the institution of private property in the interest of human liberty and social service. They cannot guide mankind towards the good life in so far as the good life involves living responsibilities towards other people in this world. They cannot lead their flocks because they do not themselves know enough to be good. Christians, indeed all profess belief in the saving quality of the personality and the message of Jesus, but their faith in Him cannot break out of the safe sanctuary of merely verbal testimony without being shattered into fragments by their disagreements, ignorance, ineptitude and irreconcilability. They are widely and apparently hopelessly divided one from another in their vision of the way in which ardent Christians can revive for the successive generations of mankind the peculiarly Christian boon of salvation. They have tried the authority of dogma, the miracle of the sacraments, the succession of the Apostles, the hypnosis of reiteration and exhortation and at very rare intervals even the actual imitation of Christ himself, but they have never agreed for long about the sufficiency of more than one method. Today they are less agreed than ever. There exists an entirely efficient anarchy of opinion among Christians as to what it means and costs to be a Christian and as to the authentic way of resurrecting Christ in the souls of the new generation of heathen which is born every minute. Christianity is paralyzed. In the case of the Protestant churches it is nothing but sectarianism tempered by scepticism. In the case of the Catholic church it is nothing but counter-Protestantism. Men glorify the state, cling to it and worship it as a God because their vision of religious truth has ceased to possess authority and integrity.

Religious anarchy has existed and steadily increased ever since the Reformation, but not until recently have its effects become sufficiently serious to compromise the process and the fabric of civilization. The Reformation severed the alliance between knowledge and religion—an alliance essential both to human liberty and religious authority. The severance had its wholesome aspect, because the human mind was bound helpless by Catholicism to a body of sacred pseudo-science. Unfortunately, however, in divorcing knowledge from Catholic realism, Protestantism immersed the human mind in a subjectivism which separated it first from any common sense of religious reality and ultimately

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from any effective sense of religious obligation. There resulted a prodigious growth of purely secular knowledge of the natural world which brought with it an even more prodigious increase in the mechanism of control exercised by man over nature. But owing to the divorce between knowledge and religion, the engineers of the new knowledge transmuted it into irresponsible rather than responsible power. The present awful predicament of civilization is born of this transmutation. The steady expansion of secular knowledge is the dominating fact in the lives of the Christian peoples. It is exercising an ever more complete and irresistible authority over both the conduct and the conscience of mankind. But its authority is devoid of moral sanction. The new knowledge has done little or nothing to enhance or to liberate human life as a whole. On the contrary it is vesting the moral ownership of incalculably formidable engines of power in particular classes and nations whose special interests are opposed to general human fulfillment. If the secularization of knowledge continues, it will ultimately wreck civilization. The integrity of the City of God can only be restored by the re-union of knowledge and religion.

The re-uniting of knowledge with religion will continue for generations to be the indispensable and salutary task of those who seek human fulfillment. Religious authority has fought since the Reformation a losing and a hopeless battle with secular power and authority. It has suffered defeat. The clearest proof of its defeat consists, not so much in the existing reign of violence and the prevalence of so much deliberately inflicted suffering and chagrin, as in the placid acquiescence in the tragedy by the Christian clergy and in their futile remedies or wretched apologies. They have not in truth deserved anything better than defeat. The beneficiaries of the increase in secular knowledge were prolific in the invention of novel machines and methods which enabled them to realize their projects of political and economic power. But those who preached the Gospel of Christ were too conventional, too ignorant, too distracted and above all too subjective to contrive methods of individual and social behavior, adapted to the experimental outlook and the public realities of an age of triumphant natural science, which would liberate and enhance their own lives and the lives of other people. That is why they are defeated and impotent. That is why the Christian Church lacks independence and authority and why the most vital religion of the present day consists in the worship of the state. If the Christian Church wishes to compete with the state for the loyalty of modern men and women, if it wishes to infect the lives of Christians with motives other than those derived from the apotheosis of private property, and if its ministers wish to regain spiritual independence and dignity, they can only do so by recovering the possession of authoritative Christian knowledge. For without such knowledge they cannot lay out paths of human salvation more persuasive to the people of today than the old paths of baptism, dogma, sacraments, propaganda and endless and fruitless exhortation.

It is manifest, also, whither they must look for the Christian knowledge which will, if achieved, serve to restore the authority of the Christian Church and gradually overthrow the sinister dominion of organized and self-righteous force. If there is any constructive Christian knowledge, it is surely a knowledge of human nature. In so far as the Christian Church has succeeded in liberating and enhancing human life, it has succeeded by virtue of the profound knowledge of human nature contained in the Gospels. In so far as it has failed, the failure is associated with a subsequent falsification of human nature. The falsification followed from the acceptance by the Church of the doctrine of an original sin which fatally afflicted all mankind and from which the sinners could escape only by a miracle of grace. Such a theory was convenient in order to square Christianity with a pre-existing paganism and with many evidences of human unregeneracy, but its implicit mechanizing of human nature mechanized also the Christian scheme of rescue and atonement. It undermined the foundations of an essentially and peculiarly Christian knowledge which was a knowledge of the liberating truth. It sanctioned the subjection and frustration of human nature in this world. The theory of human depravity and consequent immobility is always cherished by those individuals and classes who profit by an existing distribution of power and propose to write their own privileges and accidental superiority over their fellow men into the statutes of the universe. It is more alive today than ever. Modern scientific naturalists who began by conceiving mankind as fatally regenerate often ended by conceiving it as fatally unregenerate. All the contemporary enemies of human liberation are resting their case on some affirmation of human depravity and immobility and some policeman's vision of society and civilization. The disposition to secularize knowledge and keep it divorced from religion finds its completest expression and, I hope, its last ditch in this un-Christian, irreligious and perverted view of human nature.

As a matter of fact, modern science does not

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

confirm the theory of human depravity. Anthropology and psychology are beginning to converge upon a theory of man and of society which portrays them as, indeed, the arena of interminable domestic conflicts which lends some plausibility to the doctrine of depravity, but they also open the door to the liberation of men and women from their bondage by the discovery of a valid moral compensation for their immediate losses. Psychology may soon be qualified to supply to those who are interested in the art of living a much sounder science of human life than our forbears have ever had. But not unless psychologists recognize the extent to which the knowledge of human nature depends upon faith in human nature. The effective testimony in favor of human regeneracy must come from the affirmation by a renascent Christianity of the saving virtue of the imitation of Christ. The love and reverence for human life born of the imitation of Christ constitute the substance of a truth which in so far as it is acknowledged really has some chance of setting mankind free. The possessors of such knowledge could take advantage of what the human mind is learning about particular aspects of man and his natural environment in order to contrive immediately operative methods of liberation. They could build a civilization whose security would depend upon the moral authority of a Church rather than the irresistible power of a state. And that Church would consist of men and women who were capable of understanding what it means to love your neighbor as yourself and of living in the light of that understanding throughout their days in this world. HERBERT CROLY.

A Christmas Carol

THE horses were steaming. Over their heads the driver's whip cracked with the same brittle sound the wheels had on the snow. Occasionally the driver swore. But softly, and the five of us who were boxed inside his coach could not catch his choice of words. We should have huddled together, on the wooden seats, for the sake of sharing what bodily heat was still left in us. But we held apart, save now and then when a snowdrift got under the leeward wheels and toppled us into a corner. Twice the thin man whose arms were filled with packages had been sent spinning. A very small toy cannon for his son had rolled beneath the seat and down through a wide crevice in the floor. He could not reach it, though he kept trying to, at intervals. When he wasn't under the seat he sat staring sullenly at the floor, a misanthrope on Christmas Eve.

The other three were not so taciturn. The travelling salesman did most, I think, to keep the conversation running. But the dry-goods jobber and the little man with gold-rimmed glasses kept him company. Their talk had followed a beaten track, as men's talk will, this Christmas Eve. Amazing, one of them had said, that all nine of those judges had stood together. Not one dissenting vote. That wasn't generally the case, observed the man with the gold-rimmed glasses. Usually it was 6 to 3, or even 5 to 4. He was no gossip, but there was something queer about that unanimous vote. Why should nine Justices, who had never before in their lives agreed on anything, now suddenly cast their votes together? The dry-goods jobber nodded knowingly; and the travelling salesman declared that his brother, who used to live in Washington, knew it for a positive fact that there wasn't a single Justice of the Court who hadn't a cellar full of contraband. There was one Justice—Garfield, wasn't it?—who had brought so many cases of Jamaica rum into Washington that three drays had to be borrowed from the Smithsonian Institute to move it. And him having the nerve to write the Court's decision! And those lame ducks in Congress! They could act quick enough to vote down a repeal of the wartime prohibition act. But what good were they when the Germans sank the Lusitania?

There were times, however, when the conversation took a brighter turn. And it was on these occasions that the travelling salesman reached his greatest heights. He had a brother—his brothers seemed to dot those rare parts of the earth outside his own patrol—who was sending back reports of ribald triumphs in Havana. He had another brother, this one in West Virginia, who could take a bicycle and a sprinkling can and go patronize any one of the seventy-seven different mountain stills he had a mind to. He had stories, too, of his own prodigious travels. Of Rhode Islanders drinking cocktails exquisitely compounded of purchasable toilet waters. Of coughdrops, bought in Chattanooga, that might be melted into a rare elixir by the addition of warm gravy. Of the pied piper who came into Kenosha with a magic hair-oil. It was an Arabian Night's Tale. But though it set the man with glasses marvelling, it never caught and held the attention of the dry-goods jobber. The jobber listened absently. And now and then he'd rub a forefinger on the frosted window-pane and squint with one eye at a corner building no longer gay with lights. "Ike's," he'd say softly . . . . "Rudy's . . . ."

I think it was when our bus was a little more than half way on the long journey from one of New

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

York's uptown ferries to a downtown station that the travelling salesman touched off his dynamite. Probably he had been intending to touch it off, all along, but had waited for the sufficiently dramatic moment. That moment came when a traffic jam made it evident we should miss our connection by a good four minutes. The next connection was three and a quarter hours later. We were downcast. "Gentlemen," said the travelling salesman, waving a hand to all four of us, "Gentlemen, what do you say to stopping off somewhere and drinking a little toast to Christmas?"

At that moment the thin man with the packages was on his knees. He had found a hair-pin, and with it he was making another futile effort to retrieve his cannon. With a snarl he turned upon the travelling salesman. "Toast!" he jeered. "Go write a poem about it!" And back he went with head and shoulders under the seat.

The dry-goods jobber and the small man with the glasses were more cordial. But not a whit less sceptical. Since the last series of federal raids, they declared, there was nothing to be had in the city, by bribe, by theft or murder. Of course there were rumors. But they were rumors—and nothing more.

But the travelling salesman knew better. The city, he said, was wide open. All that was necessary was to know the ropes. Of course you needn't expect any success if you went around with a megaphone and a clothes-hamper. But it was easy enough if you knew how. Easy as rolling off a log. For instance, there was a place in Seventh avenue —much pounding on the window-pane—where he knew the bartender—more pounding—knew him like a brother—much hallooing at our half-frozen driver—and since we'd missed our train—instructions shouted how to reach the place on Seventh avenue—we'd go there directly and he'd show us how perfectly simple it was if you only knew how to do it.

I don't think there was anything unusual about the bar to which the travelling salesman guided us. Nor was there anything unusual about its tender. He leant on the counter—a spare man with a curl in the center of his forehead—serving his patrons with tall glasses of what might have been anything. "That's him!" said the travelling salesman as we entered the smoky room. "That's old Ed himself!"

We elbowed our way through a hostile crowd, with our uninvited driver following hopefully behind us. The travelling salesman stepped briskly to the bar. "Well, well!" he cried, "if it isn't my old friend Ed!"

Ed fixed him with a glassy eye. "My name," he said, "is George."

It might have staggered the ordinary man. It never staggered the travelling salesman. "Why, *sure* it's George!" he agreed, after the briefest of pauses. "What ever made me say Ed? As if I didn't know it was George! Why, many's the time we used to appear before the judge together, eh George?" (This to the back of the bartender's head, as he rang up twenty-five cents on his cash-register.) "And many's the time we used to skip bail together, eh George? Well, I rather guess! Ask me if we didn't! Ask me! Now, George"—(this with a suddenly confidential tone, straight at the small of George's back as he stopped to rinse two glasses in a bucket of water)—"I've got a few friends with me, old friends, friends of mine for years, come from my home town, friends since I was a lad in knee breeches. And we've got stuck in a snowdrift. And we've missed our connection. And one of my friends here has chilblains. And it's Christmas Eve. And I want to know, George, I want to know, for old time's sake, what we can have."

George looked up from his water-bucket long enough to say: "You can have a ginger ale."

When we were outside again, and had climbed back into our coach, the thin man with the packages was grumbling. It wasn't that he had expected any luck. Oh no. He knew it would be a flivver. But the trouble was, either in getting out of the coach or getting back into it again he must have upset his parcels. For one of them was missing. It was a pearl-mounted comb for his sister Grace. He could see it, but he could not touch it. It was down through the chink in the floor, with the lead cannon.

The travelling salesman, however, was there to reassure us. "Never mind," he said. "We'll win out yet. Easy enough if you know how. Easiest thing in the world if you only know how. Tell you what was wrong in this place. *That* wasn't the bartender I knew. Entirely different chap. Fellow I knew had a beard. A long white one. And his name *was* Ed. Of course I had to pretend this was the fellow I knew, once we got in there. But it wasn't. I'd have known Ed anywhere. Why, he had a long white beard . . . . Never mind, I'll tell you what we'll do now. I've got a friend in Tammany. High up in Tammany—understand? Well, this fellow's sister married the law partner of the chap who's enforcing the dry law. Get that? Pretty soft, eh? We'll go and see him. We'll just have the driver take us around and then we'll go and see him. He'll remember me, all right. Why, he and I used to steal apples together."

Well, we went to see him. He did not live where we thought he did. He did not live the second or

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

third places we thought he did. However, he lived the fourth place. But it wasn't quite accurate to say his sister married the law partner of the man who enforces the dry law. She married the cousin of the Superintendent of City Streets. But this man had, at any rate, been a politician high in the councils of Tammany. Unfortunately, however, it was in the days when Richard Croker was a young man. And on the present occasion he was in bed with tonsilitis.

But the travelling salesman didn't let that news discourage us. We tried a second politician close to the seat of power. We tried other politicians. Before our search ended we had also tried two hotels, an Assyrian restaurant, a converted stable, a deputy coroner's office, and a roadhouse in whose courtyard the travelling salesman assured us he had played as a boy of seven. We had twice left our coach, and under his guidance felt our way up back alleys and across lots, to arrive, once, at a deserted warehouse—the second time on the threshold of a Salvation Army mission. And we had come, finally, to The Red Grasshopper. It was a spot the travelling salesman had forgotten about entirely. We should never have had any of this bother, he said, if only he'd thought about it in the first place.

Here, in the Red Grasshopper, our long trail ended. It was time it ended. We had exhausted all but a little of the three hours at our disposal. The debt to our driver had reached proportions of which we had no knowledge. The driver himself was in bad temper. The thin man with the parcels, rebellious. But even as we entered, The Red Grasshopper promised hospitality. People were laughing and dancing. There was a fire on the open hearth. Two young girls were playing a piano.

We chose a table next the wall. A waiter came. Our travelling salesman looked at him, winked prodigiously, and said—said very clearly—"Cold soup!"

The waiter disappeared. He returned. He set covered dishes before us. Ah, well; life has its other compensations. You have guessed what he brought us? More than likely you have. It was precisely what we ordered. C. M.

The Body and the Soul

Tungsten threads,
Pent in glass;
Thither reaching unseen wires,
Dynamo-charged with mystery;
A button pressed:
Light;
A button pressed:
Darkness!

YENOMDRAH MALA.

News from the Sick Room

BEWILDERED observers of current natural phenomena in a disordered and confused world had begun to think that the peak of topsy-turviness had been reached when the so long despised Mexican dollar came to be worth in the open market $1.05 in United States gold currency, and at the same time the British gold sovereign, so long the world's standard of coin values, declined to $3.70. Before the puzzled analysts had been able to readjust themselves to this spectacle, they were snatched to a new high level of bewilderment by the public appearance of the Honorable Albert Bacon Fall, a Senator from New Mexico, on the steps of the White House, certifying to President Wilson's mental competency.

Nothing queerer ever happened in Washington. And the queerest part of it all is that it was taken quite as a matter of course. Nothing has so vividly shown the state of mind into which Washington has fallen. Mr. Fall's disclosure was treated as a matter of large public import. After his pronouncement for the benefit of the press, at the White House, he was swiftly translated to the Republican cloak room in the Senate wing of the Capitol and there subjected to a critical cross examination by the lawyers and doctors of the Senate. They took turns at him. It was an amazing performance. "How long were you in his bedroom? Was anybody else there? Did she say anything? In what position did you find the President; lying down or sitting up or propped up? Where did you sit? Did he shake hands with you? Which hand did he use? Did you see his other hand, or did he try to use it? Did you see him move his body or his legs? How did he look? How long did he talk and how long did you talk? Was his voice clear and his utterance unimpeded? How do you mean, husky; do you mean his voice was hoarse, or that it was thick?" (much detail on this point) and so on and so on and so on, until all the bones had been picked clean.

In point of fact, not the least illuminating aspect of Mr. Fall's revelations was his disclosure of how vaguely he had seen what he had seen. It took him some time to remember whether the President had offered his left hand or his right hand to be shaken. There were minor discrepancies between Mr. Hitchcock's report and Mr. Fall's report. The whole amazing, incredible episode has a value and an interest as disclosing the state of mind of our governors and the atmosphere in which their decision are taken for our guidance and direction.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"You are old, Father William," the young man said,
"Your hair has become very white;
And yet you incessantly stand on your head——
Do you think, at your age, it's quite right?"

"In my youth," Father William replied to his son,
"I feared it might injure the brain;
But now that I'm perfectly sure I have none,
Why, I do it again and again."

Long ago Washington was dubbed the City of Conversation. It talks about itself. It loves gossip. The present condition and situation provide rich pasturage. The motive power of the great creaking unwieldy government machine has temporarily broken down and the engine of government grinds slowly along under its own momentum. There is wholly lacking any sense of headship or direction. The departments carry on a minimum of necessary routine at such a pace that movement is barely discernible. Congress is no better posture. It is really interested only in politics and the Presidential campaign. The Senate virtually as a body is a candidate for President. It had to adjourn for lack of a quorum the other day while the Republican National Committee was in session here.

The Senators are divided on the League of Nations and the Treaty. Fifteen of them won't have it at any price or in any form. Eighty Senators are willing to ratify the League and Treaty with and without reservations. The vote rejecting the League was based on politics. The final vote was taken while each side hoped the other would give in. There is hardly a man in the Senate who is really vitally interested in the League because they all believe that the great bulk of the people at home do not care at all whether it lives or dies. All of the news that comes to Washington from the country is that the League has been entirely supplanted in the public mind and popular interest by the pressing and immediate industrial and domestic problems of everyday living. That is one reason why the "bitter-enders" on the Treaty are so willing to carry the issue of the League and Treaty into the campaign. They feel it will be perfectly safe to flog a dead horse all about over the country next summer and autumn.

The House has not an idea to bless itself with. This condition it candidly avows. It is under the present leadership of a group of old-timers who were deposed from power ten years ago by their own party associates as even at that time too reactionary and dwellers in the political Dark Ages. The Honorable Joseph W. Fordney, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, went back home to Michigan during the recent Congressional recess and the reporters at Saginaw came to meet him. As the report of this interview was telegraphed to the eastern papers, he said in substance and effect: "Things were never in better shape for us. We can look forward confidently. The Republican party has a number of candidates for President to choose from. There is a choice between those two eminent statesmen, the Honorable Warren G. Harding, of Ohio, and the Honorable James E. Watson, of Indiana. I think Senator Watson is the greatest orator in the world." Mr. Fordney does not believe in feeding the folks back home on raw meat.

No man or group of men here is thinking effectively or constructively about reconstruction problems. To find a path out of the present woods of our confusion we must look elsewhere than to Washington as it is at this juncture. A general paralysis has come upon it since Mr. Wilson fell ill. He had made himself so completely the center of authority in the seven years of his Presidency that when he became disabled bewilderment and confusion followed. Since 1912 the mainspring of national government has been under Mr. Wilson's hat. He was the Government. He decided. He indicated the direction. The other executive agencies of government carried out his decisions. He went to Paris and carried the headship of affairs there. He came home and went to bed and the seat and center of executive authority became his bedfellow on his couch of illness.

Mr. Lansing, the Secretary of State, has testified before a Senate Committee that he has not seen President Wilson since September. Dispatches were printed in the newspapers on Capitol authority that Mr. Lansing and Mr. Fletcher, the ambassador to Mexico, had seen and approved Senator Fall's resolution which provided for breaking off diplomatic relations with Mexico and that the resolution was being put through the Senate with State Department sanction. President Wilson declined to approve Mr. Fall's resolution and told the Senate through Mr. Fall and Mr. Hitchcock that he hoped it would not pass. Then Mr. Lansing denied that he or the State Department had been privy to Senator Fall's proposal or had favored its adoption.

Mr. Garfield, the fuel administrator, resigns and is called before a Senate Committee to tell why. He declines to give the committee a copy of his letter of resignation, but does say: "I believe I represent the real opinion of the President in the matter, that is, if I were able to see him and talk it over, because I know his mind." There Mr. Gar-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

field touched the heart and core of the present situation. If Mr. Wilson could only be seen and consulted much might be done. That yearning has been the undertone of Washington for seven years; simply, it has become clamorous now.

Mr. Wilson issues a statement from the White House to say that the hope of Republican leaders of the Senate that he would presently make some move which will relieve the situation with regard to the Treaty is entirely without foundation; that he has no compromise or concession in mind. Immediately certain Senators publicly through the medium of the press, question whether the statement was really written by the President, "or by some cheap politician assuming to speak the President's mind." Others cast doubt upon the validity of the White House utterance by prefacing their comments with the phrase, "if the President is correctly quoted." This is done to bewilder and confuse the public mind further and make the course of orderly administration in the present welter more difficult. Mr. Gladstone, a politician himself and much exposed through his long life to other politicians, declared toward the end of his career: "I always hold that politicians are the men whom, as a rule, it is most difficult to comprehend. For my own part, I never have thus understood, or thought I understood, above one or two."

But do not despair of the Republic. The only thing one can be sure about in a crisis or situation or condition at Washington is that it is not unprecedented; it has happened before. Washington cannot be seen intelligently or to any effect without a background. It produces crises and periods of welter and confusion in such regularly recurring cycles as to be almost susceptible to the formulation of a law of natural phenomena. Certainly the sons and descendants of Jeremiah have rended their garments, beat their breasts, and made loud lamentation before the Capitol and the White House after each of our war periods. They sat about in bewilderment as they sit now, saying to one another, "Was there ever such an extraordinary situation? Was there ever such another mess as we find ourselves in now? Was there ever such another set of dolts, knaves and incompetents in command of our destinies?" The answer is: There was. This is not the first time that the wind has moaned through the rigging. For proof:

"At Washington, in 1869-70, every intelligent man about the Government prepared to go. The people would have liked to go, too, for they stood helpless before the chaos; some laughed and some raved; all were disgusted; but they had to content themselves by turning their backs and going to work harder than ever on their railroads and foundries. They were strong enough to carry even their politics. Only the helpless remained in Washington."

"Dissolution of ties in every direction marked the dissolution of temper, and the Senate chamber became again a scene of irritated egotism that passed ridicule. Senators quarreled with each other, and no one objected, but they picked quarrels also with the Executive, and threw every Department into confusion."

"The political dilemma was as clear in 1870 as it was likely to be in 1970. The system of 1789 had broken down and with it the eighteenth century fabric of a priori or moral principles. Politicians had tacitly given it up. Grant's administration marked the avowal. Nine-tenths of men's political energies must henceforth be wasted on expedients to piece out—to patch—or, in vulgar language, to tinker—the political machine as often as it broke down. Such a system, or want of system, might last centuries, if tempered by an occasional revolution or civil war; but as a machine, it was, or soon would be, the poorest in the world —the clumsiest—the most inefficient."

"One might search the whole list of Congress, Judiciary, and Executive during the twenty-five years, 1870 to 1895, and find little but damaged reputation. The period was poor in purpose and barren in results . . . no public administrator achieved enough good reputation to preserve his memory for twenty years. A number of them achieved bad reputations, or damaged good ones that had been gained in the Civil War. On the whole, even for Senators, diplomats, and Cabinet officers, the period was wearisome and stale."

And much more to the same effect, from that keenest of commentators, Mr. Henry Adams, who lived in Washington for fifty years in the vain pursuit of an education.

What Washington is this winter, it has been, and fearfully will be again. It is always saved and rescued from the morasses into which it falls by the common sense of the people at home. Now is the time for all good men to come to the aid of their country.

Washington, D. C. EDWARD G. LOWRY.

Mountains

After the night of rain
The mountains, with silver streaming sides,
Rise through the dawn
Like bathers from the sea.

ROBERT J. ROE.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Press and Public Opinion

FOR five years there has been no free play of public opinion in the world. Confronted by the inexorable necessities of war, governments conscripted public opinion as they conscripted men and money and materials. Having conscripted it, they dealt with it as they dealt with other raw recruits. They mobilized it. They put it in charge of drill sergeants. They goose-stepped it. They taught it to stand at attention and salute.

This governmental control over public opinion was exerted through two different channels—one the censorship and the other propaganda. The ostensible function of the censorship was to keep the enemy from obtaining useful military information. Its ultimate function was to suppress all information that governments wished to suppress for any reason whatsoever. There is a popular notion born of cynicism and suspicion, that the legitimate objects of the censorship were deliberately prostituted to the business of concealing military and administrative blunders. I am inclined to doubt it. There are instances in which it was so employed, but on the whole the censor usually followed the ordinary military routine, suppressing everything that might give aid to the enemy and then suppressing everything else which his superior officers might criticise him for not suppressing. The censor's motto was "safety first," which meant safety for the censor. In consequence, the censorship was usually stupid and generally ineffective. Figaro once maliciously remarked that the French censorship had managed to keep the movements of the French troops a secret from everybody except the Germans. That was true, in the main, of all censorships.

As the war progressed, the censorship became less and less a factor, and propaganda increased in importance. Modern warfare is not a conflict between armies, but between nations, and what is going on back of the lines may be far more important that what is going on at the front. Governments relied on propaganda to equip and sustain their armies, to raise money, to furnish food and munitions and to perform all those services without which armies would be vain and helpless. The organized manipulation of public opinion was as inevitable a development of modern warfare as airplanes, tanks and barbed wire entanglements.

There were two kinds of propaganda, one that represented the appeal to reason and the other that represented the appeal to any emotions that could be directed toward the winning of the war. The classical examples of the first kind of propaganda are the British White Book, which contained the diplomatic correspondence that preceded the war, and the state papers of President Wilson defining the aims and objects of the war in terms of human liberty.

The effect of this kind of propaganda cannot be overestimated. Without it the war could not have been won.

The other kind of propaganda resembled in a general way the activities of the cheer leaders at a football game. It was noisy and demonstrative and emotional and spectacular, and as such it often served a highly useful purpose. Sometimes it was frankly mendacious, for mendacity plays no insignificant role in the drama of war. When government lies, it does not lie sneakingly and furtively, but proudly and ostentatiously.

When the armistice was signed and demobilization began, public opinion was demobilized, too. It was turned loose to shift for itself and naturally it felt a little awkward in civilian clothes. It had been trained to think only in terms of war and had almost forgotten how to think in terms of peace. Moreover, it was like the emancipated slaves of the South after the Civil War. Its shackles were struck off, but it did not quite know what to do with its freedom. It was in the habit of being told what to think and what to feel, and when it was left to its own resources it was bewildered. At this point private propaganda stepped in to take up the work that government had abandoned, and when we deal with public opinion today we are dealing largely with private propaganda.

Government suppressed the truth; government distorted the truth; government lied glibly and magnificently when occasion seemed to require; but, after all, governmental propaganda was at least directed toward war ends, and those ends were the protection of the country and its institutions against its armed and embattled enemies.

When we come to the question of private propaganda we are on wholly different ground. Private propaganda is not one of the by-products of war, but it has taken on new phases since the war. It established itself long before the war and was a development of the press agent, who from being merely a theatrical attachment, had extended himself to Wall Street, to big business and to most of the institutions that have to deal with public opinion. Shortly before the war the newspapers of New York took a census of the press agents who were regularly employed and regularly accredited and found that there were about 1,200 of them.

How many there are now I do not pretend to know, but what I do know is that many of the direct channels to news have been closed and the information for the public is first filtered through publicity agents.

The great corporations have them, the banks have them, the railroads have them, all the organizations of business and of social and political activity have them and they are the media through which news comes. Even statesmen have them.

These publicity agents, on the whole, are a very able body of men and in some respects they perform a highly valuable service, but at the same time they are essentially attorneys for their employers. Their function is not to proclaim the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, but to present the particular state of facts that will be of the greatest benefit to their client—in short, to manipulate the news.

A great deal of the confusion of public opinion today is the direct product of that system.

Take, for example, a great industrial disturbance like the coal strike. What are the essential merits of it? Do you know? If you do, you are very fortunate. I don't, although I have spared no effort to get at the facts, many of which lie further underground than the coal itself.

The reason none of us can get at the basic truth is very simple. The coal operators meet in secret and through their publicity agent they give out a statement of their side of the case. The leaders of the miners meet in secret and they give out a statement of their side of the case. Either statement by itself is plausible and believable. The two of them, taken together, are wholly irreconcilable and simply add to the sum total of human ignorance.

And thus it goes. The more of that kind of publicity we

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have the less we know, the less certain we can be of anything. But while this is a pernicious propaganda, it is by no means the most dangerous form, now manifesting itself.

After the Thirty Years' War, bands of marauding soldiers wandered around Europe terrorizing the inhabitants of every town and village to which they could gain access, and something of that sort is going on now in the United States. Bands of propagandists are wandering around terrorizing public opinion and trying to frighten it into submission to theories of government, strange to American institutions.

Some of these marauders represent radicalism and some reaction, but there is a striking similarity in their methods. Radicalism appeals to violence against reaction and reaction appeals to violence against radicalism. One menaces with threats of the torch and the bomb and the other with threats of the rope and the rifle. Both profess to be champions of human freedom. Radicalism pretends to be engaged in restoring human liberty to its primitive simplicity, and reaction, wrapped in the Stars and Stripes, is ready to have everybody else die for the Constitution as it thinks the Constitution ought to be interpreted.

A war that has shaken the very foundations of human society is bound to produce some extraordinary mental reactions. A war that has wrecked vast empires, overthrown dynasties and brought about sweeping revolutions is not likely to leave society just as it was before. Yet large numbers of excellent people think that mankind should have picked up its work where it left off when it went into the trenches and go on as if nothing at all had happened. Others were convinced that because war has resulted in revolution in certain countries there ought to be revolution everywhere —the more the better.

What the United States needs more than anything else today is the restoration of the free play of public opinion. That requires, first, the re-establishment of the freedom of discussion, for without freedom of discussion there is no public opinion that deserves the name.

Will Hays, the Chairman of the Republican National Committee, made a speech recently in New York in which he proudly proclaimed that: "There is in this country a religious faith which believes in the divine origin of the Constitution of the United States." When I first read Mr. Hays's words I was staggered by this new incarnation of Hohenzollernism. Then I saw that he had probably hit upon a serious and lamentable truth. A most energetic propaganda is engaged in converting the Constitution of the United States into a cult, into a religion, and its champions are eager to burn all dissenters and heretics at the stake.

The Constitution of the United States is one of the great achievements of all history, but criticism of it is not blasphemy, and a man is not necessarily damned who thinks that in the light of 130 years' experience a better framework of government might be constructed.

The men who drafted the Constitution certainly did not consider it a piece of divine inspiration. They knew how it was made. Nor had they any superstitious reverence for government as an institution. They regarded it rather as a necessary evil. Nor were they altogether certain, from the meagre data of a limited experience, as to the ability of the people to rule themselves. That is why they established a government of checks and balances which could not function too freely. To this day the government they created operates with great difficulty under even favorable conditions, and whenever the President and Congress happen to belong to different parties government is deadlocked and must wait for another election. But what the fathers did clearly understand was human liberty, at least in so far as the white man was concerned, and there they took nothing for granted.

It is not the powers that they conferred upon the government, but the powers that they prohibited to the government which make the Constitution a charter of liberty. The Bill of Rights is a born rebel. It reeks of sedition. In every clause it shakes its fist in the face of constituted authority and thunders "Thou shalt not," and because its ultimatum is "Thou shalt not" it is the one guarantee of human freedom to the American people unless they themselves destroy their safeguard.

We are in danger of forgetting this under the terrorism of mass thought, but we can forget it only at our imminent peril. There is revolution in reaction as well as in radicalism, and Toryism speaking a jargon of law and order may often be a graver menace to liberty than radicalism bellowing the empty phrases of the soap-box demagogue.

Writing from Paris to Abigail Adams, Thomas Jefferson said that:

> "The spirit of resistance to government is so valuable on certain occasions that I wish it always to be kept alive. It will often be exercised when wrong, but better so than not to be exercised at all."

If the author of the Declaration of Independence were to utter such a sentiment today the Post Office Department could exclude him from the mail; Grand Juries could indict him for sedition and criminal syndicalism; legislative committees could seize his private papers and search them for evidence of Bolshevism, and United States Senators would be clamoring for his deportation on the ground that he had been tainted with the ribald doctrines of the French Revolution and should be sent back to live with the rest of the terrorists.

Thus the political philosophy of one generation becomes the political anathema of another.

Now, I am not much disposed to agree with Jefferson's dictum on the moral duty of resistance to government unless it is abundantly qualified. Nevertheless, all the liberties that we hold today have come from resistance to government, and most of them were won by blood and iron. Thanks to the men who were willing to challenge authority and die for liberty, we, their political heirs, have been armed with newer and better weapons.

To Abraham Lincoln the issue of the Civil War was very simple. It was that "among free men there can be no successful appeal from the ballot to the bullet." There we are on solid ground. With universal suffrage, that is a foundation which can never be shaken, and we can build on it in complete confidence. Under free institutions, whatever can be taken to the ballot box has the inalienable right to make its appeal to the ballot box. Whatever denies the final authority of the ballot box is a challenge to the Republic, and that alone is a challenge.

This standard of judgment can be applied to all the unrest and discontent to which the country is now subjected. In so far as discontent appeals directly to violence, there is an abundance of law to meet it if public officials, municipal, State and Federal, will discharge the commonplace duties of their offices. In so far as it appeals to public opinion and the ordinary processes of representative government, we need not be disturbed for the safety of the Republic unless we lack faith in popular institutions and believe that at heart the American people are destitute of sense and sanity and incapable of self-rule.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The policy of repression that has been generally adopted by governors, mayors and police officials—in some cases by federal authority—to meet this propaganda of radicalism is fatal. Two thousand years of history bear witness to its folly. Nobody ever succeeded in bettering the weather by putting the thermometer in jail, and nobody will ever remove the causes of unrest and discontent by trying to suppress their manifestations.

Justice Holmes of the United States Supreme Court recently said in a dissenting opinion in a sedition case that "the best test of the truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market." That will always remain the best test of truth, and we cannot afford to tamper with it, however strong the immediate provocation may be, nor can we afford to suppress that competition.

In a speech delivered in Carnegie Hall last week a very eminent New York lawyer, Mr. Henry W. Taft, complained that the Department of Justice was shifting to the States the duty of prosecuting radicals, and asked: "But is not the protection of the American people against revolutionary propaganda peculiarly within the function of the Federal Government?" The protection of the people against crime and violence and the destruction of property is an elementary function of government. But government protecting the American people against revolutionary propaganda is a new manifestation of paternal authority. I wonder what old Sam Adams would say to that? Or Patrick Henry? Or Benjamin Franklin, with his grim joke about hanging together or hanging separately? Or Thomas Jefferson? Or George Washington? Or all the rest of that noble congregation of rebels who to their defiance of George III pledged their lives and their fortunes and their sacred honor?

This theory that it is the duty of government to protect the people from propaganda is Prussianism. It was the gospel of His Imperial Majesty, the German Kaiser. Protecting people from revolutionary propaganda was one of his most sacred functions. Now there is no Imperial Majesty and no German Kaiser, and no Majestäts-Beleidigung and no Divine Right. Autocratic Russia saw the doctrine in its fullest flower, and it was eventually followed by the most horrible, by the most ghastly, by the most degrading revolution known to human history. Significantly enough, no sooner was this new tyranny established than Lenin and Trotsky proceeded in their turn to "protect the people from revolutionary propaganda" by suppressing all but the Bolshevist newspapers.

Either the people are fit to govern or they are not. If they are fit to govern, it is no function of government to protect them from any kind of propaganda. They will protect themselves. That capacity for self-protection is the very essence of self-government. Without it popular institutions are inconceivable, and the moment that a republican form of government sets itself up as the nurse maid of the people, to train their immature minds to suit its own purposes and to guard them from all influences that it considers contaminating, we already have a revolution and a revolution backward, a revolution by usurpation.

How is there to be any public opinion at all if government is to be the final arbiter of political theories and economic doctrines?

When government undertakes to regulate opinions the burden of proof must always rest upon it. If history teaches any lesson whatever, its lesson is that the most dangerous and futile of all methods of combating erroneous political and economic beliefs is for government to set itself up as a judge and executioner.

But, it will be said, the doctrines that government is called upon to suppress are of foreign origin; they are advocated in large part by an alien population; they are antagonistic to the principles of the Republic, and we cannot afford to have the American people adopt them. Quite true. But what of it? This is not the first time there has been nation-wide unrest and discontent. It is not the first time that wild and lunatic remedies have been prescribed for public ills. It is not the first time that foreign revolutionary theories have invaded the United States. It is not the first time that property rights have been attacked in their very citadel.

American conservatives were once quite as terrified by the spread in this country of the extreme theories of the French Revolution as they are now terrified by the spread of Bolshevism. They were quite as eager for repression; yet the French Revolution never shattered a single American institution. It raised up no American breed of Marats and Robespierres. It set up no guillotines on American soil and beheaded no aristocrats. The American people threshed the issue out and went on their way.

Is it not possible that they still retain a scanty remnant of their ancient common sense? Is it not possible that they might even listen to a sympathetic exposition of the maniacal principles of Bolshevism without being seized with an irrepressible desire to destroy everything they have created and give themselves over to famine and disease and anarchy in order to establish a dictatorship of the proletariat.

I am not afraid of Bolshevism in the open, where the American people can examine it and weigh it and consider it. I am not afraid that the American people are going to rise up en masse and join the I. W. W. to destroy the institution of their own private property, unless government prevents them by force. It is just as well to remember that the preamble of the Constitution of the United States does not begin "We the Government of the United States," but "We the People of the United States." The history of this country for more than 140 years proves that the American people can be trusted, and in the long run they can be trusted a great deal further than the professional politicians that they generally select to represent them.

The failures of popular government have always been failures of public opinion—mostly of public opinion that was ill-informed, of public opinion that was denied the facts, of public opinion that was misguided by self-constituted masters. That will always remain a great menace, and public opinion is never to be safeguarded by trying to prevent it by law from coming into contact with political heresy. There is no surer way to give those doctrines a foothold than to proscribe them. It is not the revolutionary doctrine which is shouted from the market place that is whispered everywhere in the ear of discontent and that can claim in its favor the test of martyrdom.

There is no other such prolific breeder of revolution as reaction, and reaction is now engaged in capitalizing the militant patriotism that the war aroused. It is denying freedom of speech, denying freedom of assembly—denying the most sacred guarantees of the Constitution that it professes to guard and defend.

When the French soldiers began to return home after four years in the trenches, thousands of them declared that they would never again do any work. It sometimes seems that after the armistice was signed, millions of Americans

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must have taken a vow that they would never again do any thinking for themselves. They were willing to die for their country, but not willing to think for it, and under the influence of propaganda they had lost the habit of independent thought.

It is here that we squarely confront the question of the responsibility of newspapers in respect to the formation of an enlightened and fully responsible public opinion.

Of the work of the American newspapers in the war the most chronic fault finder cannot justly complain. They printed all the news that government would permit them to print. They almost bankrupted themselves to obtain it. They were the first victims of the censorship and the daily prey of the propagandists. They never hesitated in rendering any service of which they were capable, and they never counted the cost. On the whole, they displayed a sense of responsibility that in itself is the highest decoration for distinguished service.

When we come to the newspapers in relation to the events of the last year, it is a very different story and a less satisfactory story. Newspapers are very human institutions, and when the fighting ceased they reacted in much the way the general public reacted. The notion was general that, with hostilities ended, pre-war conditions would naturally be restored, and the newspapers followed the common notion.

That was a great mistake. They were not prepared for the waves of discontent and unrest that spread over the country. They were not prepared for the social ferment that followed the war. They were not prepared for the industrial upheavals that came. For the most part they had settled down to the comfortable assumption that with Germany beaten, with the Kaiser exiled, with the war won, everything was going to be for the best in the best possible of worlds, and that is not the way it turned out at all.

When strike followed strike, when industrial disturbances became nation-wide, when labor and capital instantly began a hand to hand fight over a new division of the profits and the spoils, when the labor leaders discovered that there was a tight labor market and began to squeeze the employer just as the banks squeeze the borrower when there is a tight money market, a vast number of perfectly good and respectable people were much disturbed in their souls, and the newspapers reflected this disturbance. Instead of trying to get at the basic cause of it all, they adopted the primitive medicine-man procedure of hunting out the devil upon whom the responsibility could be laid.

Four hundred thousand steel workers had gone out because the leader of the strike had once been a syndicalist. All the shipping in New York was tied up because I. W. W. agitators had taken possession of 80,000 longshoremen. Four hundred thousand miners quit in defiance of Federal law because two factions in the union were battling for control. And so it went. Nothing in this complicated world is ever quite so simple as that.

The first duty of a newspaper to public opinion is to furnish the raw materials for it and the tools for its formation. American newspapers are not doing this in respect to this new economic situation, as many newspaper men keenly realize, without quite knowing how to remedy it. The war has left a new set of problems and the newspapers have not yet met them. They are not driving to the heart of things. They are still skimming the surface, and it is only now and then that a reporter gets under the skin of these great events.

This, in a way, helps to account for the more or less chaotic state of public opinion in this country, and it is doubly unfortunate, because the American people have no passion for profound study of public questions until these questions reach the stage of a crisis. Day by day they like to get their news from headlines and to rely for their judgments on what somebody tells them.

The gravest duty that confronts the American press today is to bring these vast questions that have come out of the war into the forum of public discussion. The barrier of propaganda must be broken down. The competent, independent investigating reporter must come back to his own. This is vital. The American people cannot deal intelligently with any of these problems without knowing the facts, and they cannot know the facts until the newspapers brush aside the propagandists of contending factions and get back to first principles of news gathering. All this is fundamental.

It is impossible of fulfillment, nevertheless, unless the newspapers set themselves squarely against this rising Prussianism which is seeking to make a fetish out of government and endow it with the power of damnation over all dissenting political and economic beliefs. If the guarantees of the Bill of Rights are to be overridden in the name of super-patriotism, the newspapers themselves will be the ultimate victims of the new dispensation that is called upon to suppress freedom of speech and of the press, and we shall have no public opinion at all except that which cringes under the lash of office holders. If government is to be erected into a god, who of us can be sure of salvation?

Lord Acton made the security of the minority the basis of freedom and that will always be the basis, however offensive the minority's views may be and however mischievous the principles that it advocates may appear. De Tocqueville framed essentially the same definition in still more striking form when he voiced his warning against the tyranny of the majority. The inherent sovereignty of the citizen over government was pictured by Pitt in words that for a century and a half have been part of the political heritage of the English-speaking peoples:

> "The poorest man in his cottage may bid defiance to all the force of the Crown. It may be frail; its roof may shake; the wind may blow through it; the storms may enter, the rain may enter—but the King of England cannot enter; all his forces dare not cross the threshold of the ruined tenement."

Free government must forever be the resultant of all the forces that are brought to bear upon it, radical and reactionary, liberal and conservative, revolutionary and Bourbon, Socialistic and individualistic, and whenever any of those forces is compelled to resort to secrecy the equilibrium is destroyed and the way is open to disaster.

What I have said is not a plea for the new radicalism, for to me most of this new radicalism is the very negation of political and economic sanity. What I am pleading for is the restoration of the traditions of the Republic, for the restoration of the proved safeguards of human liberty, for the restoration of the free play of public opinion, without which democracy is stifled and cannot exist; for the restoration of the old faith of the Fathers which has never yet failed the nation in a crisis—the faith that they themselves sealed in heir own blood.

God forbid that our supreme achievement in this war should be the Prussianizing of ourselves!

FRANK I. COBB.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

After the Play

EVERYONE has a Lincoln of his own imagining. I found more of mine in the written version than in the acted version of John Drinkwater's play, Abraham Lincoln. Mr. Frank McGlynn is, I have no doubt, an extraordinary "find." He is a practiced actor and he is an anatomical copy of Lincoln. But when you calculate how few men in the whole world can possibly get themselves up to resemble Lincoln, you realize how slim the chance must be that out of that tiny number there should be even one actor who could not only mimic Lincoln's body but also give us the semblance of that soul, even by the aid of his remarkable likeness, is to credit both Mr. McGlynn and Mr. Drinkwater with nothing less than a miracle. For me the miracle did not come off. I was left cool by the performance—cool, disappointed and reasoning.

What I had hoped for was Lincoln's distinction of being, his depth of humanity, which never were more than tentatively established. Mr. McGlynn was concentrated, I believe, on projecting the statesman and publicist. He was anxious to give the right sort of magnitude to a President of the United States. But with his first sententious utterance, so like the talk of a pulpiteer, I felt we had a Lincoln on stilts, and only once or twice did the play escape from this enslavement to the Great Historic Figure. Mr. Drinkwater was not so obsessed. The words he had taken from Lincoln's history were often documentary, but nearly always were characteristic. From Mr. McGlynn these words came like caged words, not words with wings.

In the opening scene, for example, Mr. Drinkwater had been careful of the humane characteristics of Lincoln. First he had set him against the background of two Springfield friends, a figure homely and intimate yet esteemed and honored, and then he had set him against the background of the Republican delegation, a personage more formal and more portentous, still intimate and homely. But the fine, the light and evanescent values, of these two perspectives were imperfectly appreciated by Mr. McGlynn. Mr. McGlynn was almost as genial as an officiating Presbyterian clergyman. He produced hospitable cider as if cider were a rebuke to whiskey drinkers. He hammered papers out of his hat as if the point were grotesqueness rather than an amused negligence. The loose amplitude and casualness of Lincoln, the wide Mississippi of his lounging, drawling leisure—these Mr. McGlynn sacrificed to tall spotlight rigidities in the center of the stage. Perhaps Abraham did stand this way in the middle of the room, with lifted chin. But it isn't sociable, and Abraham Lincoln was loneliness-in-sociability if a great man ever was.

What keeps Lincoln a living presence for most of us is not his portentous mission so much as the humane spirit in which that mission was sustained. By humane spirit I do not mean humanitarian. I mean something free and fresh and warm and accessible, something above and beyond categories and formulae, something full of ripe and sweet personality and of kind humorous intuition. He had great intellect, it is true. He had a searching and pondering mind. He had also a large and ramified comprehension of values, a moral map that was not upset by turnings and twistings in the road. But mind and morals were not all, or nearly all. The whole of him was bathed in a sense of open and common humanity. He suffused his universe with a sympathy that kept morals and intellect subordinate and employed. That sympathy ran like a refreshing river through the long course of his life. It was overhung and shadowed at times. At times it crisped and twinkled in every kind of indulgent whimsicality. But is was never dammed or stemmed or dribbled or drained. It carried him, oppressed and laden as he was, from the crass frontier life of Illinois to the fiercer, meaner life of Washington. And by virtue of it he sweetened a nation's existence. All through an experience of incredible bitterness, an experience in which he was afflicted no less by his own people than by the people with whom he warred, he proved to his nation the miracle of his nature: a nature that blossomed from the hawthorn of his pain. And in rising to such heights he took his humanity and even his country with him. With his great, loose, simple, saving gesture, he lifted the multitudinous people. This, as an alien feels it, was Lincoln, or a bit of him. And it is in the saying of this that the instrument of the play somewhat fails. Yet Mr. Drinkwater must not be cheated of credit. He has lived with Lincoln. He has discovered the springs of Lincoln's sympathy. And he has given his actors a great opportunity to say what the fidelity, the equality, the fraternity of Lincoln really were.

This is the only unity that such a History could have. Mr. Drinkwater has sought to strengthen it by the employment of a Chronicler who tells the audience in honeyed verse the grave and noble implications of the succeeding tableaux. But the honeyed verse, somehow, is not Lincolnian when it is uttered. It is too literary-lyrical, too intense. Yet, by faithfulness to Lincoln's period, the play succeeeds in creating a fascinating impression of the general externals of his career. Seward's room in the White House, the Cabinet room in the White House, a room there where (imagine!) tea is served, and later General Grant's headquarters and Ford's Theatre—these scenes arouse one's historical curiosity, and especially in the Cabinet scene and the Grant scene give it rich material to play on. And Mr. Drinkwater has not omitted the magnanimity of Lincoln toward such humble folk as the Negro and the pacifist lady and the common soldier, as well as such exalted folk as Seward and Grant and Lee. He has included, moreover, the just Lincoln as well as the merciful. The Cabinet sees this just man in right perspective, though there is one incredible drawing-room scene.

At this time the United States is farther from the Lincoln tradition than ever before in its history. The evil capitalism that started in the hot-bed of the Civil War has matured in the hot-bed of the World War. And without a great-hearted president to subdue the country's greeds and passions, we find ourselves immensely strong in material power and vacillating and mean in moral direction. The policy of the nation is dictated by men who have learned little from Abraham Lincoln. It is the Tsar of Russia, not Abraham Lincoln, who teaches us to deport political critics to Siberia. It is Bismarck and Cecil Rhodes, not Abraham Lincoln, who insist that we should "clean up" Mexico. On this account, even if Mr. Drinkwater's play is not perfect, we do well to go to it and remind ourselves that our sole claim on loyalty as a nation is our fidelity to the democratic experiment. That experiment is now viciously imperilled. It may soon be injured beyond recovery. Only the tradition of Lincoln can redeem a nation which shows such malice toward the feeble, the oppressed and the erring and charity only toward the strong.

F. H.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Are We Really Christians?

Why We Fail as Christians, by Robert Hunter. New York: The Macmillan Co.

WHAT seems to be happening with the Christian religion, so far as an outsider can detect, is an increasingly desperate struggle between this-worldliness and other-worldliness. By reason of the Catholic church's authority the struggle in that region is least apparent; and in the region of scientific authority at the opposite side of human conviction there is no apparent yielding. But elsewhere the struggle is churning Christianity and political and social science to their depths. The conflict began, of course, with the development of science, it continues despite the adaptations of many scientists and many Christians. And on its outcome depends not only the future of the church but perhaps the future of Christendom.

A layman like Mr. Robert Hunter enters this conflict from the side of political science. It is not his effect, however, to bring enlightenment so much as to divert Christian energy. He is far less interested in the struggle between this-worldliness and other-worldliness than in a grand social conception of his own. But he is too solicitous for his own conception to oppose it to that side of Christianity which is other-worldly. He aims instead to read his own faith into Christianity. And so necessarily, he treats the dogmas of the Christian religion with the most consummate respect.

Nothing could be more characteristic of the present state of the struggle than this inclusiveness of Mr. Hunter's. He manages, if you observe his title, to speak not as a Socialist or Communist or political scientist but as himself a Christian. "We" fail as Christians, he tells us, writing as a follower of Jesus Christ. Since there are nine and ninety ways of being a Christian, this "We Christians" title is above criticism. And for the rest, Mr. Hunter has a simple, earnest, serious manner of handling Christian dogma which only fails, if it fails at all, because it is too perfect.

The fact remains, however, that Mr. Hunter leaves completely outside his discussion the other-worldly intention of Christianity that is indispensable to his study. He says in his preface, "Needless to say, I am not attempting here a comprehensive study of Christianity. Anyone who undertook to limit its scope to the relations between men, or to the problems of society, would lay himself open to just and serious criticism." Yet this is what Mr. Hunter proceeds to do. He tries to show that "certain social and economic conditions are absolutely essential for the germination, growth and full-flowering of Christianity," and yet he does not seem to indicate in his argument that the "full-flowering" of Christianity is not in any kingdom of God on earth but in heaven. Christianity without heaven is not Christianity, any more than beer without alcohol is beer. This is the fatal defect in Mr. Hunter's case for Christian communism, and particularly the defect in his founding that case on the authority of the words of the New Testament.

The point of this omission is not that the argument for communism is affected one way or the other. It is simply that there is no such authority behind communism as Mr. Hunter's consideration of the New Testament seems to imply. For what Mr. Hunter is bent upon interpreting in the light of this world is really deeply colored by the other-worldly consideration. And what he takes for "Communism" in the New Testament is, in the words of Santayana, the quite different recklessness of property which rightly goes with "that unworldly, prayerful, all-forgiving, idle and revolutionary attitude which the gospel enjoins."

Another and perhaps deeper criticism of Mr. Hunter's argument may be ventured. If his quotations from scripture have no ultimate value because the teachings of Jesus apply to a world that has not the same significance as the communist's—a world not an end in itself but a world as a means to the end of eternal life—these quotations are still less applicable because they do not conceivably retain their character as texts of revealed religion. How can Mr. Hunter. who is really bent on disintegrating the Christian religion in its old other-worldly character, seek to do it by the authority of Jesus Christ and the scripture—which said authority depends for its significance on the old other-wordly character of religion? In other words, how can a this-world argument be based on an other-world document? Only those who do not seriously enter into the "worship, communion and prayer" of Christianity can take such liberties with its basic faith.

But is it true that Mr. Hunter does not enter seriously into those functions of an other-world aspiration—worship, communion and prayer? Speaking solely from the evidence of his book, I cannot see how a practicing Christian could so seriously misunderstand Tolstoi. Mr. Hunter reviews Tolstoi's career as a failure, the point of his failure being that no Christian, not the biggest genius and greatest saint of modern times, could succeed as a Christian in a non-communist world system. "When the communistic ideals and practices were crushed out of the early Church, the earthly kingdom of God disappeared, and with it the possibility of the truly Christian life. But now men everywhere are beginning to see that if Christianity is to become something other than 'a beautiful and ineffectual angel' as it is to some, or a sham and hypocrisy as it is to others, it must have its roots firmly planted in the earth." But is this the way to judge Christianity or any Christian like Tolstoi? Tolstoi believed in salvation. He believed that "the sole hope of mankind lies in the Christian life." Was he saved or damned? That is the only way to judge his Christian success or Christian failure. Does he stand with the angels in heaven, or not?

Ignoring Tolstoi's burning faith in eternal life and eternal salvation, Mr. Hunter is inevitably bewildered and amazed. "Despite the real greatness of Tolstoi, he was, after all, but an individual with no organization whatever to support him." "To the astonishment of everyone, he refused to lend a hand to the forces of democracy." "By this self-imposed isolation he placed obstacles in his own path that were fatal to the spread of his faith and doctrines." "Among them [the Russian peasants] exists an immense opportunity for the spread of views such as Tolstoi held, but instead of espousing their cause or seeking in any manner to organize the peasants for cooperative action, he invariably taught them submission, nonresistance to evil, loyalty to their masters, and the most extreme form of Christian humility and service." "Tolstoi, who is otherwise so enlightened . . ."

The main reason Mr. Hunter finds Tolstoi "unenlightened" is surely that he doesn't share Tolstoi's faith in the reality of the next life. If the next life is a fact, indeed, Mr. Hunter's communism loses much of its claim to be an indispensable prerequisite. Good as it may well be, it is only indispensable and prerequisite according to the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

criteria of a this-world idealist, who tests providence as an earthly providence.

Perhaps if religion and science are transvalued, Mr. Hunter's argument for communism may be seen in a better light. But how is religion to be transvalued if men like Mr. Hunter appear to entertain so respectfully the antique dogmas of religion? Neither laymen nor clergymen, it seems to me, can go on playing on both sides. It is an impossible compromise. It calls for too much tiresome obfuscation. F. H.

Liberalism in America

Liberalism in America, by Harold Stearns. New York: Boni & Liveright.

THE word, liberalism, was introduced into the jargon of American politics by that group who were Progressives in 1912 and Wilson Democrats from 1916 to 1918. They wished to distinguish their own general aspirations in politics from those of the chronic partisans and the social revolutionists. They had no other bond of unity. They were not a political movement. There was no established body of doctrine. American liberalism is a phase of the transition away from the old party system. But it is an early phase and there is no agreement as to ends or methods. Intellectually it is still more transitional. If it has any virtue at all it is that many who call themselves liberals are aware that the temper of tolerant inquiry must be maintained.

I take it that Mr. Stearns agrees with this. His book is an account of the breakdown of a rational temper during the war. There is no doubt about the breakdown. But there is the greatest doubt as to the success of Mr. Stearns's post mortem. With some charm and a little shrewdness and considerable skill he explains to liberals who have been reiterating the fact for many months, that the war resulted in a domestic reaction at home and a defeat of the official war aims abroad. Now Mr. Stearns is too able a critic to deserve any praise for that discovery; his book is an effort to search out causes, and will be judged by the results of this effort.

Liberalism during the war is his theme. The liberals who supported the war are the objects of his criticism. But at no point in the whole book can I discover a plain statement as to what Mr. Stearns himself believed and believes about the war. He is not a conscientious objector to war, like Mr. Roger Baldwin. He is not an internationalist like Mr. Max Eastman. He believes in defensive wars, whatever that may mean. He believes in "social revolution," but he denounces the Bolsheviks for conscription and prohibition. He distrusts politics, and yet he disclaims direct action. He dislikes conscription very much. In fact at one point he describes it as absolutely incompatible with liberalism. At another point he simply argues that voluntary enlistment is a better way of raising armies. Mr. Stearns is rather elusive. Although he writes two hundred and thirty-two pages of criticism about the attitude of the pro-war liberals he never once definitely commits himself on the following point: Did Germany's attempt to win the war in 1917 by destroying Allied sea power constitute a danger real enough to justify war? After reading his book I do not know what Mr. Stearns thinks.

I know that on the whole he dislikes war, that on the whole he thinks no positive good can come out of it. But I do not know whether he thinks that it was wise or foolish to believe that a German victory won by submarine control of the Atlantic Ocean was something that America was justified in resisting with all her power. Because I do not know what Mr. Stearns thinks about this I cannot intelligently discuss this book. If he will abandon his reserve and his caution by stating frankly what his premises are, he will not be under the suspicion of having evaded the main issue. For it is not possible to analyze liberalism in wartime, and be silent about the meaning of the war.

In the autumn of 1916 the President opened a diplomatic campaign to find out whether a peace by conciliation was possible in Europe. In view of the fact that Germany was then the conquering and invading power, conciliation presupposed the voluntary abandonment of Germany of the territory she held. She declined to abandon it. The recent German inquiries into the diplomatic history of the war prove that the military party wrecked all diplomatic effort because it believed that the submarine could bring complete victory. It was the submarine that brought America into the war. Why? Because it was ruthless and illegal. Yes, in part. But there was a greater reason than that, and it was this reason which back in February, 1917, determined the attitude of the liberals whom Mr. Stearns laments. They asked themselves what the success of the submarine campaign would mean, and I believe they were right in asking that question, because with America neutral the campaign might easily have been completely successful. They saw that it meant in the west the annexation of Belgium, of Briey, and probably of the channel ports; in the east a suffocation of all the rebellious nationalities together with the probability that a victorious Germany could really destroy the Russian Revolution. Germany, it should be remembered, is geographically in a position to do what Winston Churchill is not in a position to do. But that was not all. They saw that a peace dictated to an England starved into submission meant the fragmentation of that quarter of the human race which is organized in the British Empire. And the political and social chaos which would have resulted from the destruction of the British Empire is a thousand times greater than that which has resulted from the destruction of the Austro-Hungarian.

The British Empire is so vulnerable to criticism in Ireland, India and elsewhere, and on the other hand we are all so habituated to its existence, that it is rather difficult for Americans to realize the place it has in the structure of the world. With all its faults and all its dangers it is, in the opinion of many sincere democrats, an indispensable piece of political organization. Its destruction is not something to be contemplated blandly by any one capable of visualizing the significance of it. In the winter of 1917, Americans, whether they were liberals or conservatives or what not, had very quickly to decide what Mr. Stearns has not yet decided: whether they would tolerate or resist the seizure of sea power by the German military party based on the domination of the continent.

Those liberals who decided for war were convinced that conscription was preferable to volunteering for several reasons. First, because of the profound effect upon German morale, a judgment which proved to be correct; second, because of the extreme economic waste involved in indiscriminate volunteering; third, because of a belief that the coercion of self-appointed recruiting committees would be accompanied by that reckless violence of which the attempt to recruit money by "voluntary" methods was only a mild taste. If Mr. Stearns will imagine the Liberty Loan drives

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

multiplied by ten as recruiting drives, he may reconcile himself to the fact in the circumstances, conscription was a little less evil than the alternative. He will reconcile himself, of course, only if he thinks that the war was necessary.

Even in retrospect I see no reason to doubt the soundness of these two judgments. They were forced upon America quickly by events which were not of her own making. There was nothing distinctively liberal or illiberal about them. They do not fall into those categories. The distinctively liberal phase of the war lay elsewhere. It consisted chiefly in an attempt to use victory to create a League of Nations based on a democratic peace. In this, liberalism was defeated. The first object of the war, the defeat of German ambition, was accomplished. That in itself justified American intervention. What was lost, temporarily at least, was a golden opportunity to make a great advance in human relations.

Mr. Stearns, I gather, really believes that no such opportunity existed in this war. But he does not say so flatly. At one time he quotes with approval the eloquent pessimism of Randolph Bourne; at other times he cites with approval the criticisms in the recent months written by men who supported the President till his failure at Paris had been demonstrated. Now between Randolph Bourne who disbelieved from the first, and Walter Weyl who hoped until the end, there was a vast difference in practical and ultimate philosophy. One believed that the war was fatally bad. The other believed that its higher aims were lost by a fairly narrow margin through technical, intellectual, and moral defects. Before any analysis of liberal defeat can be undertaken the difference exemplified by Weyl and Bourne must be clarified. This Mr. Stearns fails to do. Just as he argues about the war without facing the issue of it, so he discusses the peace without making up his mind whether Wilsonism was pure buncomb or an ideal that might have been realized.

My opinion is that it could have been realized more nearly than it was, and the reasons why it was not would be the book that Mr. Stearns started to write. Among the first reasons I should put that defect of the liberal mind which Mr. Stearns exemplifies but does not discuss. I mean its apathy about administration, its boredom at the problem of organization, its failure to make its own what may be called roughly the constructive tradition of Alexander Hamilton. Mr. Wilson attempted to achieve a diplomatic miracle without a diplomatic service. So long as liberalism is content to be above the battle as Mr. Stearns says it should be, it will be one of the graces of a cultivated gentleman but never a force in actual affairs.

Closely allied to this administrative inertia is a shrinking from intellectual effort. The urbane temper and tolerance of liberalism easily confuses itself with something very close to indolence. Mr. Wilson himself is an incurable improviser, and no idea is deeply rooted in him because no idea is thoroughly mastered. At Paris the conservatives had a better grip on their case than did the liberals. They had worked harder. They had planned more thoroughly. They had manipulated better. They were infinitely more resourceful. They dealt with situations from the inside and not eternally by hearsay inspiration and guess from the outside. They knew how to negotiate. They knew how to go past the fragile reason of men to their passions. They made liberalism in the person of its official representatives seem incredibly naive. They knew how to do everything but make peace in Europe.

In spite of its congenital defects liberalism was triumphant on the day of the armistice and could, I believe, have consummated that triumph at Paris had the official liberals grasped the mechanics of the peace. They were deeply related to the war. For just as the threat against sea power was the central reason for our intervention, so a working partnership with sea power was the indispensable basis of a liberal peace. We should have played with Britain, instead of letting Mr. George bob back and forth between M. Clemenceau and the President. For the sake of a partnership with the United States, Britain was prepared at that time to make a Wilson peace and a real League of Nations. Britain had not only the influence to produce such a peace but she had the technical experience which we lacked.

But on the signing of the armistice the Administration proceeded to pick a quarrel with Britain about a ridiculous battleship program, and American officials arriving in Europe were filled with suspicion about the economic position of England. With exquisite tact they threatened the British people just emerged from a terrible raid on their maritime communications, with a new race of armaments—America substituted for Germany. Mr. George was precipitated into the arms of M. Clemenceau at the beginning of December and Mr. Wilson was a beaten man. In rejecting a working partnership with Britain, Mr. Wilson had cut himself off from the nation in which liberalism is mature and powerful. The only forces left were the revolutionists and to them he dared not appeal.

The theater in which events have taken place is so vast and the factors so complex that a complete diagnosis is not yet possible. But it is possible to come much closer to the problem than Mr. Stearns has come. His book seems to me the work of a man who has attempted to write about a very great historical event with more temperament than information. His bibliography tells the story and so do his citations. They move entirely in the realm of interesting opinion, of things that a man might notice by reading some magazines and newspapers and books during the war and talking much with a circle of friends who had the same irritations as he himself.

WALTER LIPPMANN.

Recent Publications

Have Faith in Massachusetts, by Calvin Coolidge. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co.

GOVERNOR COOLIDGE of Massachusetts has already loomed above the horizon as one of those who are determined to save America from the poison of unrest. This volume is intended to explain the principles upon which his effort is founded. Some of his deeper insights may be listed.

1. "The welfare of the weakest and the welfare of the most powerful are inseparably bound together." (p. 3).
2. "The hope of tomorrow lies in the development of the instruments of today." (p. 12).
3. "Men must work for more than wages, factories must turn out more than merchandise, or there is nought but black despair ahead." (p. 18).
4. "In political affairs the vote of the humblest has long counted for as much as the vote of the most exalted." (p. 28).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

5. "It was the same spirit that made Massachusetts that made the provident institution for Savings." (p. 60).
6. "The scientists tell us that the same force which rounds the teardrop moulds the earth." (p. 66).
7. "The realities of life are not measured by dollars and cents." (p. 173).
8. "The classic of all classics is the Bible." (p. 185).

It is perhaps unfair to choose out separate dicta in this fashion; for each lies securely embedded in a speech of which it is the fair representative. But it is good to know that Martin Tupper and Samuel Smiles, though dead, yet speak. Of that great classic tradition Governor Coolidge is the true inheritor.

A Childhood in Brittany, by Anne Douglas Sedgwick. New York: The Century Co.

IN A Childhood in Brittany, Miss Sedgwick has recorded the memories of an old French friend, "born at Quimper, Brittany, 1833." The date and the place are sufficient to indicate frail porcelain, white coifs, and semi-feudal quaintness. Under fingers less deft than Miss Sedgwick's, the porcelain would certainly have broken, but she has the artist's careful affection. Not once does sentimental picturesqueness stick out. The narrative flows naturally on, straight, clear, humorous, casual. It never goes beyond the tongue of a direct and charming old lady who is talking unaffectedly about her gay childhood; remembering the gentle naiveté of the Demoiselles de Coatnamprun, and how Tante Rose, dressed in a morning gown of puce-colored silk, dispensed yellow cream to the poor of Landerneau. She is charmingly aware of the white and blue beauty of her country, and many of her descriptions are as if painted in clear water colors. It is unnecessary to add that no social consciousness bothers her. The only glimpse one gets of the reverse of the tapestry is once when she peeps into the basement kitchen of a neighbor's château, "and the dark immensity, streaming, as it were, with cooks, servants, kitchen-boys and maids, so bewildered and almost frightened me that I never ventured there again." On the whole one is glad she didn't. It might even be confessed that A Childhood in Brittany is rather a relief from the social consciousness. — The illustrations are as delicately graceful as the text.

Contributors

EDWARD G. LOWRY is a journalist who was formerly city editor of the New York Evening Post. At the outbreak of the war in Europe he was attached to the American Embassy at London as Special Agent of the Department of State, in charge of the German division. On America's entrance into the war he joined the army as a captain in the Military Intelligence. He is the author of Rhode Island Conditions, Today and Tomorrow in Canada, and Foreign Banks and Financial Systems.

FRANK I. COBB is the chief editorial writer of the New York World. This article was delivered as an address before the Women's City Club of New York, December 11, 1919.

Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Webb would turn out of their attractive little house, facing the Thames, between Westminster Abbey and the Tate Gallery; and leave it, all standing, for an American tenant between March and July, at any date required

The house contains four bedrooms (besides servants room), bathroom, two sitting rooms and a secretary's office with telephone. Rent 300 guineas up to three months, with option to extend for another month at same rate. Inclusive of all rates and taxes, including water, plate, linen, telephone, and wages of two trained English servants of long standing (cook and house-parlormaid) who would undertake any housekeeping desired.

Apply to Sidney Webb, 41 Grosvenor Road, Westminster Embankment, London.

TO SUBSCRIBERS

(*Confirmed and Intending*)

THE mechanical cost of filling subscriptions has almost doubled in the past two years. And is still going up. In order to bring it down, The New Republic henceforth will adopt the current practice among publishers of *not sending formal acknowledgements of remittances*. For example, when you renew your subscription, you will no longer receive a post card stating that your check actually came. Instead, the wrapper on the second issue following the receipt of your renewal will bear a new expiration date, thus automatically informing you that your remittance was received and your subscription extended. If you are a new subscriber the receipt of copies and the expiration date on the wrapper will be our acknowledgement.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE
THE CHRISTIAN SCIENTIST, 10c. a copy; dollar a year.
622 Audubon Building, New Orleans, La.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED